Doctrine and Defense.

Theological and ecclesiastical contemporary history

Monthly Bulletin.

Published

by the

German Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, et al. St.

Edited by

Teachers' College of St. Louis Seminary.

Luther: "A preacher must not only feed, so that he instructs the sheep how they should be true Christians, but also ward off the wolves, so that they do not attack the sheep and lead them astray with false teaching and introduce error, as the devil does not rest. Now many people can be found who are willing that the gospel should be preached, if only one does not cry out against the wolves and preach against the prelates. But though I preach rightly, and feed and teach the sheep well, yet it is not enough to keep the sheep, and to keep them, lest the wolves come and lead them away again. For what is it built, if I cast up stones, and I see another cast them in again? The wolf may well suffer the sheep to have good pasture; he loveth them the better that they find feist; but this he cannot suffer, that the dogs bark in hostility."

Forty-ninth volume.

St. Louis, Mo.
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE.
1903 .

Content.

January.

Page

Preface 1
The current struggle in the field of Assyriology 16
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary 21

February.

The Newer Pentateuch Criticism 33
A Study of the Death of Our Lord on the Cross 37
The current struggle in the field of Assyriology 45
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 50

March.

Religion in the state schools 65
A Study of the Death of Our Lord on the Cross 74
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 79

April.

The Newer Pentateuch Criticism 97
A Study of the Death of Our Lord on the Cross 105
Religion in the state schools 109
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 119
Literature submitted 128

May.

The Reports of the Watertown Conference 129
The Newer Pentateuch Criticism 133
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 142

June.

The Newer Pentateuch Criticism 161
Religion in the state schools 169
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 181

July and August.

Dangers of the soul of a pastor 193
How does knowledge differ in the natural and spiritual spheres? 201
The Newer Pentateuch Criticism 214
Conversion alone God's work of grace 227
Literature 231
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 232

September.

Page
Leo XIII 257
Theological Dicta Classica 275
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 278

October.

The Newer Pentateuch Criticism 289
Theological Dicta Classica 296
Literature 301
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 302

November.

Use and abuse of the analogy of faith 321
The Newer Pentateuch Criticism 329
Theological Dicta Classica 336
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 340
Notice 352

December.

Use and abuse of the analogy of faith 353
The Newer Pentateuch Criticism 359
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 365

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 49. **January 1903.** **No. 1.**

Foreword.

The Christmas season is once again behind us, during which the miracles of Christianity were presented to us in great numbers. Two great miracles stand out among many: the incarnation of the Son of God and the virgin birth in Bethlehem. Along with the resurrection and ascension of Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, these are the main miracles of Christianity. And as the sun and moon are surrounded by numerous stars, so these great miracles are surrounded by a wreath of lesser miracles. By God's great grace, we Missourians are still among the people who heartily hold fast to these miracles of which the Scriptures tell. We still believe the miraculous story of the birth, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. We are not yet swayed by the "conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of Mary the Virgin, and risen from the dead". We still celebrate Christmas and Easter, Ascension and Pentecost in the old full sense of the word. We believe that the great miracles which give the Christian feasts their content, and without which they themselves become empty schemes and their celebration sinks to pure hypocrisy, are real facts and not myths. In our Synod there are as yet no preachers or teachers who deny, combat, conceal, or even timidly speak of these miracles. On the contrary, we rejoice as often as the Christian festivals return, because they offer us the opportunity to testify with loud mouths to the great deeds of God for the redemption of the human race. Yes, we are convinced that without the miracles which we commemorate at the Christian festivals there would be no Christianity at all, and that with these miracles Christianity itself would disappear from the earth. And the holy Scriptures, which report these miracles, are themselves a great miracle of God, namely, God's inspired and therefore infallible Word. We therefore believe not only the great principal miracles of Christianity, but all, absolutely all the miracles of which the Scriptures speak.

of the Old and New Testaments. And whoever in our midst would doubt these miracles and find fault with the biblical accounts of them, we would not even acknowledge him as a member and brother in our congregations, let alone tolerate him as a preacher in distant pulpits and as a teacher in distant schools and institutions.

This is, as I said, a great grace of God, for today not all who call themselves Christians and Lutherans and are members of Christian congregations or even preachers in their pulpits and teachers in their high and low schools stand in this way. For liberal evolutionist theology and criticism has swept over Christendom like a great tidal wave. Liberal theologians and higher critics lead the great word in German, English and American universities. From here this theology finds its way into Christian pulpits, into Christian schools, and even into the mission fields of the church. And numerous church organs are eagerly at work to popularize the teachings of these theologians and Bible critics and to make them palatable to the people. How great and general is the sympathy which is shown for this newest theology is shown by the approval and applause which its leader in Berlin, Harnack, has found in all countries and in almost all church communities, and by the large band of minions and helpers who have risen to him everywhere. And like a cancer this theology is still eating away at itself, and even for the American Lutheran Church it has already become more than a mere threat.

The task, however, which this evolutionist theology and criticism has set for itself is, in short, this: to purge Christianity of its miracles. The supreme thesis of this liberal theology and evolutionist critique is: miracles and prophecies do not and cannot exist, and the miracle reports in the Bible are to be relegated to the realm of myth and poetry. This liberal and critical theology differs from the vulgar rationalism of the eighteenth century only in that, instead of common sense, it applies the theory of evolution, according to which everything is supposed to have come into being naturally, as the standard for judging the Bible and its accounts. 1) Formerly - so speak these proud

1) The rationalists of the eighteenth century, for example, reduced Christ's resurrection to suspended animation, and his walking on the sea to walking on the sea. The miracle of the feeding is simply explained by the fact that the people, following the example of Christ and the apostles, took their provisions out of their pockets. It was a friend of Jesus, unknown to the disciples, who at the transfiguration on the mountain, in the mist of the early morning, called out to the disciples the words: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; him shall ye hear. (See Frank, "Gesch, d. n. Th.," p. 52.) And of the latest scientific theology, the "E. K. Z.," in its number of November 23, writes: "And how stands historical criticism? Is it guided by any other endeavor than that of eliminating from the world the supernatural, the incomprehensible? The old rationalism tried it with

The Bible teaches us that the teachings of the Bible concerning the Incarnation, the virgin birth, the Atonement, the Resurrection, etc., were impossible for him. To him the Bible's teachings of the Incarnation, the Virgin Birth, the Atonement, the Resurrection, etc., were monstrosities of thought, for which he was absolutely convinced. They are monstrosities of thought, for which he has absolutely no understanding and which he cannot gain any interest in. It had now been recognized that the greatest as well as the smallest things in the universe obeyed unalterable laws, and that there could be no question of a breakthrough of these laws or of a miraculous intervention of God in the course of nature and history. Now the wind no longer blows as it pleases, but according to laws which meteorology is able to formulate. If now the rain fails to fall, or Sodom and Gomorrah perish in fire, the cause is no longer sought in the wrath of a god, but in sunspots, earthquakes, fire-breathing mountains, and other physical processes. The miracles reported in Genesis 1 have long since been eliminated by astronomy, geology and biology. There is no more room in history for Noah's ark, Jonah's wall and the other miracles of the Old Testament. The same is true of the miracles of the New Testament. What cannot be explained naturally must fall. This is true not only of the miracles performed by Christ and the apostles, but especially of the miracles which the Gospels report of the person of Christ. In the incarnation of God, in the conception of the Holy Spirit, in the birth of the Holy Spirit, in the

of the natural explanation of miracles, then came Strauss with the unconsciously poetic mythe; now one achieves the purpose much more simply and thoroughly by suspecting the witnesses. A naturalist like Huxley remarks: "With reference to the miracle question, I can only say that the word 'impossible' is not applicable to my mind to natural science. That the possibilities of nature are infinite is a saying with which I am accustomed to bore my friends.' But the moderns no longer enter into this question at all; they simply assume everywhere that which was to be proved, namely, the impossibility of miracles and prophecies. Why are the history books of the Old Testament untrustworthy? Because the religion of Israel must have developed naturally, like every other cultural phenomenon. Why are so many prophets and psalms to be relegated as spurious to much later times? Because their prophecies can only be understood as vaticinia post eventum. Why, in particular, can the Synoptic Gospels not have been written before the year 70? Because Jesus prophesies the destruction of Jerusalem and the desolation of Galilee. Why is Marcus the original gospel? Because it does not contain the story of the Immaculate Conception and the Ascension (?). Why can the Gospel of John come only from the middle or the end of the second century? Because the character of the Johannine Christ is psychologically incomprehensible. Why are the 'we' portions of Acts very credible, the others not? Because they do not report miracles as these do. In short, all we really find here is the trivial wisdom: mouths don't happen/"

The fact that any account in the Bible speaks of miracles, of the resurrection and ascension, is reason enough and sufficient to call it a fiction or a forgery. The fact that any report in the Bible tells of miracles is reason enough and sufficient to call it fiction or a forgery. Miracles and prophecies do not and cannot exist, - this is therefore also the standard by which the content and origin of each individual book of the Bible must be finally judged.

Dr. Harnack, in his paper, "The Essence of Christianity," says: "As breaking through the connection of nature, there can be no miracles." (p. 17.) "Certainly, no miracles occur, but of the miraculous and inexplicable there are enough." (p. 18.) "That the earth has ever stood still in its course, that an ass has spoken, that a storm of the sea has been quieted by a word, we do not believe, and never shall believe again; but that the lame have walked, the blind have seen, and the deaf have heard, we shall not summarily dismiss as illusions." (P. 18.) "What is incomprehensible to you" (the audience before whom Harnack delivered his lectures) "here" (in the four Gospels) "you calmly put aside . . . . The miracle question is something relatively indifferent to everything else that is in the Gospels." (p. 19.) "Two Gospels, to be sure, contain a prehistory (birth-story), but we may disregard it; for even if it contained more credible things than it really does, it would be as good as meaningless for our purposes." (P. 20.) The Easter faith can and ought to be had "even without the Easter message" of the bodily resurrection of Christ. (p. 101.) "If this (Christ's) resurrection meant nothing else than that a dead body of flesh and blood had been made alive again, we would soon be done with this tradition." (p. 101.) "Whether the apostle (Paul) knew the message of the empty tomb? Respected theologians doubt it, to me it is probable ; but a complete certainty cannot be gained." Dr. Solan writes: "Never will a scholar, who is acquainted with the orders and laws prevailing in the world, believe in a bodily resurrection of the departed, in an ascension of Christ, in healings par distance, and all the foolish notions which the apocalyptic hopes of a feverishly excited age have produced. With such things children and old women may be charmed, not serious inquirers."

Such is the presumptuous and blasphemous speech of the liberal theologians and evolutionist critics against the holy Scriptures with their miracles. And in their zeal to bring their ungodly doctrines to the people and especially to imbue the future preachers and teachers of the church with the same and to give them practical instructions how they can inculcate the same without rumor among the Christian people, these wolves and Satanic apostles usually find only weak, feeble, half and despondent resistance from the so-called positive and faithful professors and preachers.

digers. In Germany, where liberal theology and destructive criticism are now celebrating their orgies as nowhere else in the world, there is much complaining by the positive about the proud challenge and presumption of liberal theology. Conferences protest, synods address petitions to the Minister of Culture to ward off the agitation and to put a stop to the proud spirits; one even threatens not to want to entrust the studying youth to them any longer. But it does not come to action; it remains with protests and petitions. The faithful preachers and professors fight, but with half a heart, as one fights for a lost cause. To their petitions and resolutions for the abolition of the aversion they add the explanation that it is a vain effort and that everything will remain the same. Indeed, they often seek to save themselves from the savage attacks of their opponents by themselves revealing one miracle after another, and by generally approaching and nestling as closely as possible to their opponents in their discourse and teaching on miracles. There is little sign of holy courage and defiance against the enemies of Christ and His Church among the positive. And this is no wonder, for they have long since given up the only and ever-victorious blade of the divine Word. They have abandoned the doctrine of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and have adopted the principle that the Bible, and especially the accounts of its miracles, must be explained according to the results of science. They dare not, and no longer understand, to oppose the mighty γίγρα-ται το their proud opponents. And

If they nevertheless do so, it is no longer in the unshakable belief that they have hurled an inspired, infallible, and therefore destructive word of God at the opponent's forehead. By abandoning the doctrine of inspiration, the positive theologians have left the fortress which the gates of hell shall not prevail against, and have gone to a ground (science and inductive research) on which they must be defeated. Yes, these positive theologians need only be consistent and really follow their principles, and they will find themselves in the midst of the camp of those who still fight them as enemies of Christianity and all its wonders.

A religion cleansed of absolutely all miracles - that is what the latest theology strives for. But its representatives do not admit that they have become pagans and are no longer Christians, and that they can no longer celebrate the Christian festivals. On the contrary, these liberal theologians assert with great self-confidence that they are the only true representatives of Christianity. Christianity is understood by them in a much truer and purer way than by the apostles, Luther, and the orthodox theologians. The positive theologians who believed in miracles clung to the shell of Christianity, while they, the liberals, went to the very essence of it and sought the unadulterated truth.

the hidden core of Christianity. "The essence of Christianity" - that was the title of Harnack's book! They had not abolished Christianity itself, but had only taken off its old, colorful skirt, patched together from all kinds of heathen fairy tales and myths. They would have broken only the frame of the image of Christ, which came from a long-outmoded cultural world, from the fairy-tale-rich infancy of mankind, but they would have carefully preserved the image itself and given it a frame corresponding to modern culture. This is precisely what they have made their task, to free the Christian truths from the wrappings and coverings of contemporary history and to present them in terms of modern education and science. They are not enemies of Christianity, but people who not only have a right and full understanding of the essence of Christianity, but also of the needs of our time. They were not out to eliminate Christianity from the world, but earnestly endeavored to bring it as close as possible to modern cultural man and to make it acceptable. At the end, however, the miracles of the Bible would have to fall. And that would not be a loss, but only a gain. For the more one gets rid of the miracles of the Bible, the closer one comes to the sweet core of it, uncovered by all bitter shells. And for this very reason it was necessary to bring out the essence of Christianity, which could only be done by getting rid of the fairy tale cover and strictly cutting out all fabulous things. Yes, the miracle reports in the Bible were not merely superfluous additions and ballast, but downright distortions of Christianity. If, therefore, Christianity were to be cleansed of its Greek tinsel and its historical coating and wrapped in a modern garment, it would only gain, both in itself and in the respect of the people. In its naked and pure form, Christianity shines much brighter, more beautiful, and more attractive than in the ancient robe of miracles. It is, therefore, a sign of great ignorance when the positive deplore the purifying work of higher criticism and the fall of miracles as a misfortune. What, not to speak of the miracle reports in the Old Testament, e. g. the calming of the storm on the Sea of Galilee, the transformation of water into wine at Cana, etc., have they to do with the nature of Christianity? And what would Christianity lose if these and similar miracle reports were erased from the Bible? In short, the difference between the liberals and the positives does not consist in the fact that the former reject Christianity, while the latter accept it, but rather in the fact that the positives lay all their stress on the transitory, unessential, contemporary clothing, and thus cling to the mere shell of Christianity, while the liberals are concerned solely with the true essence and the innermost core of Christianity.

But with this the liberal theologians give themselves over to a most sad illusion. There is no such thing as a Christianity without miracles. A Christianity without miracles is a contradictio in adjecto. The attribute cancels the main concept. No one can fall prey to a greater deception than when one thinks that he has the naked, pure Christianity in his hands, after he has peeled off all miracles from it. Harnack seems to have felt this himself when he wrote in his "Essence of Christianity": "We should not be like that child who, seeking the kernel, defoliated a rhizome until it had nothing left in its hand and had to realize that these very leaves were the kernel itself." (p. 9.) Precisely what Harnack ostensibly wanted to avoid actually happened to him. When he had finished defoliating and had eliminated not only the preceding, accompanying, and following miracles of Christianity, but also the "received of the Holy Spirit, born of Mary the Virgin, risen from the dead," there was in his hands a very miserable remnant, a mixture of lies and natural truth, but not a trace of Christianity. The "Independent," which walks entirely in Harnack's shoes, raises the question in its number of December 4: "Now what is left if the faith in miracle goes?" His answer is, "If the miracles of our Lord should be discredited as history, the teachings of His Gospel must remain. The peculiar glory of Christianity is in the regeneration which it brings to the soul. It teaches no Buddhist self-effacement, no mere Jewish honesty of righteousness, but that central reforming of the soul which puts it under the rule of love. It is not enough to do no wrong to one's neighbor; one must positively love his neighbor and even his enemy. Whether Christ was born of a virgin or not, whether His flesh and blood and bones rose from the sepulcher or not, whether four (?) hundred believers saw Him ascend into heaven or not-and we shall not hasten to give up our belief-we yet know that the Christian religion rests on the Sermon on the Mount, on the Eleventh Commandment, on the regeneration of the soul taught to Nicodemus, on Paul's psalm of charity. So, if the miracles should one of these days have to go, we should still hold fast to all the duty, the obligation, the service, the character, the new heart, the holy life of love, and should still believe that we had retained all that was vital in Christianity, all that the miracle was used to support." A little morality + the lie that God is gracious to the sinner even apart from Christ, - that is what is left to the liberals. But a little morality + the lie that God is merciful to the sinner even without Christ, just that is heathenism.

Therefore, however much and proudly the miracle-denying theologians

and higher critics may talk of Christianity and the essence of it, - in reality they are heathens in the full sense of the word, and their Christmas and Easter celebrations are vain hypocrisy and travesties of Christianity. To the critical and speculative theologians in the first half of the nineteenth century, David Strauss raises the question, "Are we still Christians?" This question is identical with the question now being asked by the liberals, "Have we still the essence of Christianity?" From Harnack, however, Strauss differs advantageously by his fine self-knowledge, his better knowledge of Christianity, and his honesty, for Strauss answers the above question with a decided "No" and, if he were still alive, would today answer the question posed by the liberals in the same way. Yes, if the wondrous modern theologians wished to speak the truth, they would have to openly confess: "We are heathens; we are no longer Christians; we deny not merely incidentals in Christianity, but the very inmost essence of it; we have not merely stripped Christianity, but emptied it; we are full-blooded heathens." That would be true and honestly spoken. Christianity is not merely a religion accompanied and surrounded by many miracles, but it is itself, and essentially, a miracle, the greatest of all miracles. Of all the supernatural miracles reported in Scripture

1) The monistic philosopher Eduard von Hartmann writes in the journal "Deutschland, Monatsschrift für die gesammte Cultur" that the liberal theologians are wrong to call themselves Christians, thus: "As is well known, there is absolutely no agreement about what Christianity is. The word denotes a completely different content in the early Christianity of the first century, in the Greek church of the sixth, in the Roman church of the eleventh, in the Protestant church of the sixteenth century, and in the twentieth century the dispute about the nature of Christianity has flared up anew. I seek the decisive characteristic of the Christian religion as distinguished from all others in that which the four semi-baptismal stages of development have in common with one another as a central dogma, that is, in the unique God-manhood of the Redeemer Jesus Christ. Measured by this characteristic, the ultra-rationalism of the beginning of the nineteenth century, the liberal and speculative Protestantism in its midst, and the left-wing Ritzianism of its beginning no longer fall under the concept of Christianity, although they all, because they associate another concept with the word, claim in good faith to fall under it. In the same way, most of the newer philosophers are no longer representatives of the Christian religion, even if they themselves claim to have brought true Christianity to its purest expression. The deviations of these philosophers from the teachings of the Christian church are in part much greater than mine; but public opinion forgives them because they hold fast to the name of Christianity. I am not pardoned for my comparatively lesser deviations, because I am conscious that I can no longer bring my standpoint under the historical concept of Christianity, because I am too honest to do violence to the concepts, and too open to let my ship sail under a false flag."

According to the facts, Christianity itself is the great central miracle, around which all other miracles circle like satellites. All the miracles of the Bible, yes, all the true miracles in the world, gravitate toward the person of Christ and cluster around his birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension: all these things belong to the very essence of Christianity. Yes, since the creation of the world there has basically been only one novum under the sun, one great miracle, which cannot be derived from nature and the forces of the universe, but is the result of a special divine counsel and supernatural intervention in the course of the world: Christ and Christianity and all that is connected with it. Christianity did not emerge from below, from the world, through evolution, but was sunk directly into the world from above, from God, as something completely foreign to the world. With Christianity, entirely new powers and potencies, spiritual powers, entered the world from without, and were not born out of the world from within.

We readily admit that by no means all the individual miracles reported in the Old and New Testaments are essential to Christianity. Many of the biblical miracles could be missing without Christianity losing its integrity. And if a Christian is not acquainted with many of the miracles of the Old and New Testaments, his Christianity need not therefore be essentially deficient. John closes his Gospel with the words: "There are also many other things which Jesus did, which, if they should be written one by one, I fear the world would not understand the books to describe them." Thus many of the miracles which have been reported to us could still be missing, and Christianity would still remain intact. Not all miracles belong to the essence of Christianity, although they are all related to it. Many miracles are, as it were, only precursors and companions of the great main miracles which are essential to Christianity. He who draws from this fact, as liberal theologians are wont to do, the conclusion that all miracles in general are unessential to Christianity and may be denied without any harm to it, is not only a bad theologian, but also a poor logician: he falls into the vulgar fallacy a particulari ad universale. If one can imagine away many of the miracles reported in Scripture as unessential to Christianity, there still remains a remnant of miracles, without which there is no Christianity. Among the miracles of Christmas and Easter, many might be lacking without the Christmas and Easter feasts themselves being lost to us. But he who denies the Incarnation and the virgin birth and resurrection of Christ can no longer celebrate these feasts; he has abandoned the essence of them and with it the essence of Christianity.

Christianity is essentially a religion of miracles. The innermost core of Christianity consists in great miraculous deeds of God. And to anyone who knows what Christianity is and finds its essence described in the words of Paul: "God was in Christ and reconciled the world to himself," this is something quite self-evident. In the second article of the Apostolicum the miraculous deeds of God, which form the marrow and bone of Christianity, are enumerated. Without these great deeds there is no Christianity, and compared with them all other miracles pale, even those of creation. Harnack says: Christ himself does not belong in the Gospel. But Christ says, "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." Christ is the Alpha and Omega of Christianity. And Christ is a wonder in his person and in his work; he is called Wonderful. He is the new thing sent into the world by God. He is not, as liberal theology asserts, a child of his time, a natural flower of the people of Israel. Although all the forces of the universe are concentrated in a single point, they could not produce Christ or his like. Christ is not from below, from the world, but from above, from the Father. He is not the pinnacle of the natural development of mankind, but the God-given Savior of sin-corrupted mankind, who came from heaven. Christ is not what his time has made him, he is not a product from below, but a gift of God from above to the world. Christ is a miracle in the true and greatest sense of the word, and without Christ there is no Christianity.

To the miracles of Christianity also belong all the faithful whom the Father gave to the Son as the fruit of his suffering. Miracles no longer happen, say the theologians who are hostile to miracles, and they quickly draw the conclusion that there have never been any miracles. But just as this conclusion, which is made of once for all, points to a defective faculty of thought, so the assertion on which it is based testifies to a defective faculty of observation, nay, to complete spiritual blindness. Miracles still happen today, great miracles, miracles in the true and full sense of the word. It has been rightly said: next to the Christ Child, the Christian Child is the greatest miracle in the world. Every Christian is a miracle of God, and the Church is an aggregate of innumerable miracles, greater and more glorious than the miracles which were wrought in Egypt, yea, far greater than the miracles which Christ and the apostles wrought on the bodily sick and dead. When a man is born again by water and the Spirit, when a man becomes a living child of God out of one who is spiritually dead, then a novum has come into being, a new creature, a work of the almighty grace of God. Nor is a man born again from below, through evolution of the natural powers, but from above, through divine intervention in corrupt nature, through an

God's new creation. The new birth and conversion is not a natural psychological process, not a product of the physical and spiritual powers existing in the world, but a supernatural and therefore truly wonderful work of grace of the Holy Spirit. Even if all the natural forces in the whole world were to converge on one point, they would still not be able to produce a single Christian child. The children of God in the world who believe in Jesus' name are not born of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. The Christian is a fact in the world that cannot be explained by any factors from the world, whether physical or psychological. In other words, the Christian is a miracle, a work of God's grace, created in Christ Jesus by the miraculous working of the gospel, which itself is a miracle, not wisdom from below, but divine revelation from above. If there were no supernatural effect of the Holy Spirit in the gospel, there would be no church and no Christianity in the world.

Christianity also presupposes miracles and holds out the prospect of miracles. With one hand, it points back to miracles in the past, and with the other, it points forward to miracles in the future. The miracles to which Christianity points back do not belong to its essence, but they are among its necessary conditions. Without these miracles, Christianity lacks the necessary foundation. If one eliminates them, as is done by the evolutionist theologians, one pulls the ground out from under Christianity's feet. Among these miracles belongs first and foremost the creation of the world and of man, as it is described to us in Genesis 1. If, as modern science maintains and according to which the Bible is to be interpreted, the world was formed out of the mist of fire, if vegetable and animal life on earth is the result of millions of years of development, and if man has risen very gradually from Moneron, through the ape, to homo sapiens, if Adam and Eve are not historical but mythical persons: then there is also no Fall and no original sin, then sin in man is only a remnant from earlier animal states, then there is no Fall at all, but only a gradual ascent of man, then there is no wrath of God, then no atonement is necessary, then there is nothing with the God-man reconciler and redeemer, and the whole idea of Christianity is based on a reversal of the facts. If evolution is the key to the mystery of the world, Christianity, with its doctrine of sin and the atonement for sin, is vain deceit. The miracle of creation is the necessary prerequisite of Christianity. And just as Christianity presupposes miracles, so it also holds out the prospect of glorious miracles. Christianity is certainly in

But not a kingdom of this world and for this world, as the Ritschlians would have it. Christianity points Christians beyond this world to a state of transfiguration and perfection through God's great miraculous work. God is far from finished with his miracles. Miracles have happened in the past, miracles are still happening today, and miracles will happen in the future, miracles in the true sense of the word. Christ will, as He promised, come again in the clouds of heaven, He will raise the dead, wonderfully transfigure the bodies of the faithful, and surround them with the joys of paradise. These are all great miracles which cannot be explained by any physical processes. And he who denies these things destroys the hope of Christians, and with it the faith and Christianity itself.

Christianity, however, is a religion of miracles. Miracles are essential to Christianity; it presupposes miracles, holds out the prospect of miracles, and is accompanied and surrounded by numerous miracles. Miracles in Christianity are not mere outward accessories, not mere ornaments and decorations from ancient times, not mere forms of contemporary history and transient modes of appearance. The great main miracles, of which the Bible tells, form the core and the essence of Christianity. And the numerous subordinate miracles stand in relation to the main miracles and grow out of them, which gives them the character of the factual, the surrounding, the self-evident and thoroughly credible. Taken and considered separately, these subordinate miracles would remain incomprehensible. But in connection with the central miracles of Christianity, each one, even the seemingly smallest and most irrelevant, gains great significance. That the Christmas miracle of the Incarnation of the Son of God is surrounded and accompanied by all kinds of smaller miracles is quite in keeping with the matter at hand and is by no means conspicuous or objectionable. The same is true of the numerous miraculous accompaniments of the great Easter miracle. If a great fire is burning somewhere, we find it quite in order for sparks to fly and light and heat rays to be sent out in all directions. Such sparks of the chief miracles are the numerous secondary miracles of which the Scriptures tell. They remain incomprehensible until they are brought into connection with the central miracle of Christianity. He who, with the liberal theologians, denies the essential miracles of Christianity, can only be annoyed at the concomitants of them. But he who views them from the standpoint of the central miracles will not be offended, nor will he endeavor to reduce them in content and extent. When a king comes along, we are not surprised to see a large retinue. The numerous subordinate miracles in Christianity are also satellites, attendants, and servants of the main royal miracles.

And as such, they are quite appropriate to the situation and the environment. In addition, these miracles, which are not essential to Christianity, are not merely outwardly attached to the great central miracles, as ornaments are to the Christmas tree. Rather, they are fruits that have grown out of the main miracles of Christianity itself. The glory of the Child in the manger was the radiance of Bethlehem. When the curtain in the temple was torn, the earth shook, and the sun lost its light, it was an effect of the shattering fact of Christ's death on the cross. Of the miracle of Christ at Cana it is said, "He manifested His glory." A ray of the Christian Central miracle! The same is true of all the miracles of the Old and New Testaments: they are rays of the glory of Christ and of the God who revealed Himself in Christ. If there were no Christianity in the world, there would be no miracles in the world at all. If God had not conceived the plan of redemption, what would induce him to intervene anywhere in the course of the world? A world without Christ would be a world without miracles.

All true miracles in the world flow from the central miracle of Christianity and are closely connected with it. And this fact imprints all miracles reported in Scripture, even the seemingly least, with the stamp of being purposeful and credible. It is therefore a sign of great ignorance when unbelieving theologians place the miracles of the Bible on the same level with the lying signs and wonders of paganism, Pabstism, and enthusiasm. Quite apart from the obvious lies and deceit with which everything here is saturated, they lack the central miracle, as the concomitants of which they could be understood. What should the divine central miracle be, to which the miracles of the papists, spiritualists, eddyists and faith healers could be related? They are hostile to the great miracle of Christianity. But a second miracle of God, which contradicts the miracle of Christianity, does not and cannot exist. True and credible miracles exist only in connection with Christianity. What otherwise presents itself as an actual miracle bears eo ipso the character of the lying, the magical, and the satanic on its forehead. This also explains the fact that only Christians, who judge all miracles from the central miracle of Christianity, are immune to the seductive and lying miracles and signs outside of Christianity, while the enemies of Christian miracles are to be found among the clairvoyants, fortune-tellers, sorcerers, in the seances of the spiritualists and in the Satanic schools of the Eddyists and Dowieites, as once the unbelieving Saul was with the witch at Endor. Wonder-work and wonder-flight have rightly been called the characteristics of our Christ-hostile times. Miraculousness and the flight from miracles, - one is not without the other. Like the un-

If the Christian faith leads into the arms of superstition, the same people who ridicule and reject the miracles of Christianity tend to fall a victim to the lying and magical miracles of Satan. While the Christian thus retains a safe, sound, and well-founded judgment even in those things (spiritualistic and other strange phenomena) which the world is helpless and helpless to confront, the wicked race of our day is like the Pharisees and Jews in the time of Christ, when they demanded miracles from heaven and fell for every deceiver, but blindly passed by the great miracles that were before their eyes.

If we finally ask for the ultimate reason of the modern awe and enmity against the Bible with its reports of miracles, we point to the self-righteousness in which the liberal theologians and critics and all those who fall to them have drowned. The pagan delusion that man can acquire salvation by his own works, or, as liberal theology prefers to express it, by his own good character, carries with it a bitter and irreconcilable enmity against the Christ who was given up for our sins and raised again for our righteousness. The proud liberal theologians with their followers do not want to be poor sinners, and do not want to be saved by Christ alone. This fact alone adequately explains the fanaticism and the absurd hypotheses with which the liberal theologians tear the Bible to shreds and tear it into a thousand pieces in order to eliminate the Christian miracles from the world. Self-righteousness was the real reason why the Pharisees and Jews did not want to know anything about Christ. And the same paganism is also raison d' etre of evolutionist theology and anti-Bible criticism. There would be no liberal theology if there were not "theologians" who are pagans and self-righteous Pharisees at heart. If the great miracle of Christianity stands, that God's Son became man in order to make lost sinners blessed by suffering, dying, and rising from the dead, Pharisaism is thereby also judged in the hearts of unbelieving theologians. This they feel, and therefore all their rage is directed against everything called miracles in Christianity. If, on the other hand, the doctrine of man's blessedness through his own character, in a natural way and by natural powers, stands, there is no room for God's miracles for our blessedness, which we remember especially at the great festivals. But once the Christian central miracles have fallen, what should and do the satellites and companions of the same still want? The liberal theologians, of course, and all those who cheer them, indulge in gross self-deception even in the question of the actual origin of their theology. For they imagine and try to make others believe that their theology, which is devoid of all miracles, is the scientific result of their scientific

research according to scientific methods. But the theologically and psychologically only correct diagnosis stands: The latest scientific theology, together with its research, research method and result, stems from the pagan heart of its representatives.

For us, this leads to the lesson that we can only remain firm in our faith, especially in the miracles of Holy Scripture, and offer sure resistance to the onslaught of modern unbelief, if we do not tire of diligently pursuing the doctrine of the justification of a poor sinner before God through Christ's blood and death. As long as the conviction lives in us that we are lost and damned sinners who could only be saved in such a way that God himself became man and suffered and died for them, so long will we also remain master of the flood of unbelief. God has hitherto preserved us in grace from all "scientific" theology, both the newer and the newest. In our midst no higher critic has yet attempted to make himself heard. One has wondered greatly about this and asked what the reason for this might be, since Germany, the cradle of Lutheranism, is literally flooded with higher criticism and liberal theology. Here and there the answer has been given: The Missourians are retarded in culture; they lack important men who are equal to the intellectual work that criticism requires; once the Missourians have become thoroughly acquainted with the modern sciences, modern criticism and skepticism will come to them of its own accord, etc. But it costs but a glance at the puny work of thought of the higher critics to convince oneself that even the weakest Missourian would soon be rid of the wretched ruses and whistles of this art. What critical theology presupposes is not a special degree of mental acuteness, but of Pharisaic conceit. From higher criticism excludes spiritual, but not mental poverty. And what has hitherto saved us Missourians from critical theology is the fact that with us the doctrine of sin and grace has been diligently practiced. The gospel of the grace of God in Christ Jesus has made us divinely certain of the forgiveness of sins in the blood of Christ, and at the same time convinced us that in the holy Scriptures with their miracle reports we have before us the inspired and therefore infallible word of God, which we cannot contradict and against which we tolerate no contradiction in our midst. We will be well if we remain true to this. Then we will also in the future celebrate Christmas and Easter in the old great style and in the full sense of the word. F. B.

The present camps in the field of Assyriology.

Against the assertion of Friedrich Delitzsch in his book "Babel und Bibel" (Babel and Bible), that the Holy Scriptures are in many parts only a reworking of Babylonian legends and myths, P. W. Knieschke and Dr. Fritz Hommel, the former in the book "Bibel und Babel, El und Bel" (Publisher: W. Faber & Co., Berlin. Price: 1 Mark) and Dr. Hommel in: "Die altorientalischen Denkmäler und das alte Testament" (Publisher: Die deutsche Orient-Mission, Berlin. Price: 1 Mark). From these writings, we will follow several passages on the origin, nature and significance of the excavations made in Babel, Nineveh, Nippur, El Amarna and other places, as well as several statements concerning the present struggle in this field.

For orientation, Fr. Kniefchke first of all: "The excavations take us to the regions of the Euphrates and Tigris, where the great cities of Babel and Nineveh once lay, cities whose history is, so to speak, the history of antiquity. Since 1802, one inscription each had been brought to Paris and London from these regions, which attracted the attention of the learned world. It was increased by further, even if only small finds. Especially the German orientalist Julius Mohl was inspired by the discoveries to high hopes. Full of ardent zeal, he communicated his plans to the naturalist Botta, who had been sent to Mosul by the French government as a consular agent. The success was that the latter resumed the excavations. If one now wants to get a picture of the excavation area, one starts approximately from today's Mosul. Opposite it are two built-up hills, called Kujundschik and Nabi Junus, the ruins of the former Nineveh. About four hours northeast of Mosul lies another hilly place, Khorsobad by name. At the mention of this name, one may well say here, the heart of every archaeologist beats faster; for what happened here meant nothing less than the birthday of Assyriology. The very first excavations uncovered the palace of the ruler of Nineveh, Sarrukin (Sargon), the conqueror of Samaria. And this palace was like a magic palace: the walls, adorned with precious alabaster reliefs, tell of a long-gone period of splendor from the days of prehistory. Sargon, seated on his throne, or talking with his field marshal, or rattling along on a fine chariot - all as vivid as if the figures, long since reduced to ashes, had risen again from the grave. This palace alone supplies a wealth of material. But one was not content with this. Excavations were also made on one of the two hills mentioned above, and further south of Mosul, in what is now Nimrud, and everywhere with success. One did not come from the astonishment here-

It was as if a fairy-tale world had opened up and taken on flesh and blood. I will pass over the details, since I do not want to write a history of the excavations, but only a little orientation. Since then the excavations have continued with few interruptions. Babel, with the group of ruins of Barsippa and the Birs Nimrud, has been laid bare; at Nippur, southeast of it, a temple has been excavated; the much-sought city of Ur of the Chaldees, where Tharah, the father of Abraham, dwelt, has been found in the immense heap of ruins of El-Muquajjar, on the right side of the lowest course of the Euphrates. Also Karkemish, the ancient Hittite royal city (not one with the Circesium of the Greeks and Romans), where once Nebucadnezzar won the great victory over Pharaoh Necho in 605, was discovered in the ruins of Jerubis-Europos on the right bank of the Euphrates, northward from the river Sadshur, diagonally opposite the present Biredfchik. Another excavation area than the one described lies in Egypt; here, too, the human spirit of exploration penetrated the depths. Between Thebes and Memphis, Egyptian fellahs had dug for antiquities and brought to light about 300 clay tablets. Some of them, preserved in the Berlin museums, contain the oldest correspondence between Jerusalem and the Pharaohs even before the immigration of the Israelites to the Promised Land, as one scholar put it: 'a diplomatic correspondence from the 2nd millennium BC'. Three years ago the researches again entered a new stage, inasmuch as the German Oriental Society sent out an expedition to Babylon, which has taken up its abode there and is championing Germany's honor in the field of science as well."

Knieschke writes further about the found tablets with the cuneiform inscriptions and the decipherment of the same: "Those found tablets are now available in all sizes, from one inch to one foot in square. The most common writing material was clay, which occurs in abundance in the lowlands of the two great rivers Euphrates and Tigris, similar to the use of slate in our country. For writing one used, as with us the stylus, so there an ivory stick, whose one cut surface forms an oblique triangle. This stylus was pressed into the clay and drawn long, thus producing a figure, first broad and then tapering, a wedge; hence the name cuneiform. The tablets already described were hardened in fire. But how was it possible to decipher this writing? Well, cuneiform writing had already been found at Persepolis. Here one was in the fortunate position to find inscriptions in other languages under the cuneiform text. But still the decipherment was not so easy, because the words were not separated by any signs. Only proper names like Darius, Hystaspes, Xerxes offered firm clues. Today we know that the prevailing direction of writing is the daredevil position of the written colums, namely the production of the same from

right to left. The latter is already shown by the fact that the daredevil wedges possess the pressure when writing on the left. The content of what is written on these tablets is very different: historical, mythological stories, religious records, scientific treatises, yes, even laws, contracts, etc.. In Nippur, for example, the business documents of the great merchant firm of Murashü and Sons there, dating from the time of Artaxerxes (450 B.C.), have been brought to light."

But what is the value and significance of these inscriptions, especially for the Bible? Knieschke answers: "In many cases it is considered scientific to consider these inscriptions as the older and therefore only authoritative sources of knowledge, to attribute objectivity and greater credibility to them alone. But one should already consider one thing: as paper is patient today, so was clay patient then. There is preserved for us in Scripture a quite characteristic speech on the occasion of the Assyrian invasion under Sanherib. It is found in the historical appendix of the first part of the prophet Isaiah, Cap. 36 (cf. 2 Chron. 32, 10-12.). Hezekiah is not addressed by Rabshakeh, nor is he given a title, but the 'great' king of Assyria and his power are spoken of in the most boastful terms: 'How couldst thou repulse the throng of one satrap among the least servants of my lord!' Against Yahweh himself he boasts: 'Have the gods of the nations saved every one his land out of the hand of the king of Assyria? Where are the gods of Hamath and Arpad,' etc. (Cf. Isa. 10:8. ff.) - And he who could speak thus pompously through his emissary, whose power failed miserably at the holy city of God; Yahweh himself spoke through the plague (?). Now what do the excavated finds show us? A relief from Sanherib's palace at Nineveh depicts the Assyrian Great King enthroned before his tent in view of a conquered city, and the accompanying inscription says: "Sanherib, king of the universe, king of Assyria, sat on his fine throne and examined the spoils of Lakish. That which could detract from the fame is concealed or glossed over with fine phrases, that is Assyrian-Babylonian historicity, objectivity! It is well known that these rulers still ascribe to themselves deeds that their predecessors already accomplished, to say nothing of the pompous titles, phrases that we run out of breath to read." In other words: If anywhere, the "art" of cutting was understood in Babel.

In addition to these falsifications and exaggerations in the interest of vanity and fame, there are other things that make the Cuneiform reports unreliable. Among these, Father Knieschke counts especially obvious contradictions and the uncertainty in the translation. He writes: "But apart from this, I would like to point out one inconsistency in particular, which somewhat depresses the claim with which Assyrian-Babylonian research appears. Dr. von Strauß and Torney namely say

in an article on this point: The writing and mythology (of Egypt) shows itself to be a product of the Sumerian culture, namely in the form in which it was adopted by the Semitic North Babylonians. This process would fall approximately in the time from 3000 to 2500 B.C.. From the same time, however, are the ancient Egyptian pyramid texts, whose first writing must be even older. If Egypt had been so dependent on Babylonian culture, how then can those older pyramid texts already contain those symbols, etc., as they became common in North Babylonia? So we see, also here contradictions. And with the reading and interpretation of the cuneiform writings it is still such a thing. A glance at such a lexicon is enough to show us all the gaps, assumptions, combinations, etc. before our eyes. Furthermore, it should be noted that not only original representations have been found on the Euphrates and Tigris; there are also copies of earlier literary productions. Prof. Ed. König has occasionally made the following judgement: The cuneiform writings cannot be placed next to the literature of Israel as absolutely reliable documents. Therefore, it is not necessary today to warn against underestimating them, but it is necessary to warn against overestimating them. The similarity of the biblical and cuneiform reports refers only to external features of the history of revelation. Whatever can contribute to the illustration, clarification and better understanding of the Scriptures, we will gladly accept and thank the scholar for giving us new stimulation. But as to the revelation itself, the only authoritative book is the Bible." (S. 10.)

It is obvious that this fact greatly favors the overestimation and misuse of the Babylonian discoveries. But the greatest danger of the misuse of the Babylonian discoveries lies in the Assyriologists themselves. The great majority of them look at everything they see and read in Babel through the spectacles of evolution. The consequence is that they not only misinterpret and distort what is really given, but also, where they lack the necessary facts, simply invent them. Knieschke writes: "The modern theory wants to portray the development of religion from the lowest stage of animism and fetishism up to ethical monotheism and from mere custom to authorized divine law. Every religion, she says, develops according to a very definite progression from the lower to the higher. Even the Jahvereligion of the Old Testament is not exempt from this. With inexorable logic it seeks to carry out this law. Thus, at the beginning of the development, the Yahweh of the Scriptures becomes for her soon a fire god, soon a Moloch, who sees in human sacrifices a rightful part of his worship, soon a national god, who is no more to his people than Kamos is to the Moabites, soon a god of light and of the sun, from whom the sun's glow and the consuming fire originate. From

From here the development proceeded to the stage of a, as one thinks, only truly spiritual and humane concept of God, to the idea of Yahweh as an abstraction, an idea. To this view of the theorists of development the Biblical theory stands brusquely opposed, namely, that the belief in a moral Deity and in a divinely given law was already present in germ and essence at the threshold of the national life of the people." (S. 56.)

Also Friedrich Delitzsch was obviously under the influence of the theory of evolution when he wrote his book "Babel and Bible". He writes: "Even the faith in Yahweh, with which, like a banner, Moses united the twelve nomadic tribes of Israel, remained for many centuries afflicted with all kinds of human weaknesses: with those naïve anthropomorphic views that are peculiar to the youth of the human race, with Israelite particularism, pagan sacrificial cultus and external legalism. (p. 59.) It was only under the high pressure of the idea of evolution that Delitzsch was able to make the fantastic assertion of the Babylonian origin of the Jewish and Christian religions upon the facts before him. This is shown immediately by his first example of Creation. Knieschke gives the Babylonian account of creation as Schrader translated it from the cuneiform inscriptions. It reads thus: "l. When the heavens above did not yet proclaim, 2. the land below did not yet give a name, 3. for the abyss was their first begetter, 4. the surging sea the bearer of their universe, 5. then their waters embraced and united; 6. but the darkness was not yet taken away, a shoot had not yet sprouted. 007 When none of the gods had yet arisen, 008 when they had not yet given a name, when they had not yet determined their destiny, 009 when the gods were created, 0010 when the gods Lachmu and Lachamu came forth, 0011 and they also rose up. 12. the gods Sar and Ki-Sar were created. 13. the days expanded, 14. the god Amu, 15. the god Sar." Berosus of the third century B.C. has also preserved for us a fragment of Babylonian creation poetry. The content of the various reports is summarized by Fr. Delitzsch as follows: "In the primordial beginning of all things the dark chaotic primordial water, named Tiamat, surged and surged. But as soon as the gods began to form an orderly world, Tiamat, usually presented as a dragon, but also as a seven-headed serpent, rose up in bitter hostility against the gods, giving birth to monsters of all kinds ... and prepared for battle against the gods. All the gods tremble with fear as they behold the terrible adversary, only the god Marduk, the god of light, ... offers himself for battle on condition that he be given precedence among the gods." ... The battle now ensues, the monster is defeated. "Thereupon Marduk cuts Tiamat smoothly like a fish, forms from one half the

From the one the heavens, from the other the earth, clothed the heavens with moon, sun, and stars, the earth with plants and animals, until at last the first pair of men, mingled from clay and divine blood, emerge from the hand of the Creator." (p. 13.) Of this fantastic cosmogony and theogony, to which even the concept of a creation by the word of God is utterly foreign, and according to which actually not the world but the gods came into being, Delitzsch says that the Mosaic account is a corruption! Then one cheaply asks, "Under what rapacious pressure was Delitzsch when he wrote down this conspicuously nonsensical assertion?" F. B.

(Conclusion follows.)

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The Lutheran Church in America, according to the "Lutheran Church Almanac" for the year 1903, numbers 62 synods, of which 15 are independent, but the rest belong to the four larger bodies: General Council, Synodical Conference, General Synod, and United Synod of the South; 7080 pastors, 11,678 congregations, and 1,728,810 communionable members; 4478 parochial schools, in which 3170 teachers teach 184,902 pupils, and 6104 Sunday schools, with 57,246 teachers and 525,467 pupils. For church purposes outside the parishes $1,252,466.26 was raised. - There are 116 Lutheran institutions of higher learning in our state. Of these there are 23 theological seminaries with 905 students, 50 colleges with 8833 students, 32 academies with 2962 students, and 11 colleges for young ladies with 1095 students. At the various institutions 898 professors teach. There are 99 charitable institutions, namely 43 orphanages, 18 old people's homes, 19 hospitals, 11 emigrant and seamen's missions and 8 deaconesses' homes.

That the German language in church and school is being more and more supplanted by the English **language in** our country is especially evident in the South. Most of our city parishes, which were formerly entirely German, are now almost predominantly English, and in order to meet the requirements of the many English speakers, the English language is constantly in use in all official acts in those parishes. But the English movement-as it may be called-is also making itself more and more felt in the North, especially in the larger cities, and not only in circles of our Synod, but also within other Lutheran bodies. For example, the Swedish Augustana congregation in Minneapolis, Minn. one of the largest Swedish congregations in the country, has reportedly been forced to introduce the English language both in the pulpit and in the congregational bulletin. (Evangelical Lutheran Gazette.)

The Danish Lutheran Church in our country, in association with several missionary societies in Denmark, wants to start a mission in Utah. A committee has already been appointed to lead the enterprise. In Denmark they want to raise half of the expenses, while the Danes in this country want to raise the other half and call the missionaries. Especially in Denmark the

Mormon apostles have seduced many to their abominable false doctrine in recent years. It is hoped that many of these seduced ones can be won back.

The Minnesota Conference of the Swedish Augustana Synod recently received the following proposals from the Pacific Conference of the same Synod: 1. the Conference requests the Augustana Synod to break its connection with the General Council at its next annual meeting; 2. to unite with the independent German and Scandinavian Synods. (3) Since the General Council has in recent years again sought union with the General Synod, whose reformed doctrinal type and practice brought the Council into existence, the Augustana Synod cannot be expected to maintain union with any church body which does not accept the Augsburg Confession as its foundation of faith. The proposals, however, were not adopted. - Of the pastors of the Augustana Synod, two again, Carlsen and Magnussen, resigned their offices to return to Sweden. If the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis raise 8200,000, Gustav Adolf College is to be transferred from St. Peter, Minn. to St. Paul. From a prominent lumber dealer 50,000,000 cubiksuh of lumber has been promised for the construction in St. Paul. And Dr. Andreen, of Augustana College, Rock Island, has left for Sweden to receive the 100,000 crowns promised for the building in St. Paul. F. B.

In 1898, the Methodist Episcopalians decided to raise **a thank offering of 20 million dollars** by December 31, 1902. The enterprise succeeded, and on December 31st an appropriate thanksgiving service was held in the evening. The money will be distributed as follows: $9,000,000 for church debts, $8,150,000 for the 86 high schools and universities, $2,750,000 for charitable institutions, $600,000 for the conference fund and the rest for churches in neglected places. This is proof that even large sums can be raised easily if everyone participates and preachers and congregations see to it that everyone is addressed seriously. But the Methodist bishops had seen to it that not a soul was overlooked. And therein lies the secret of their success. Everyone was urged to contribute something. In our country, too, there is neither a lack of money nor a lack of good will to offer it to the church for its great and glorious work, but in many cases there is a lack of an orderly and prompt way of appealing to the good will of each individual and of offering him an opportunity to contribute. The largest single gift presented to the Methodists came from the son of a former pastor: $400,000. In all, one twenty-fifth of the enormous sum is said to have been given by pastors' sons. Each donor was permitted to determine for what purpose he wished his gift to be used: for colleges, seminaries, indebted congregations, or provision for old preachers. The Methodists in Canada and England have also had great financial success. We have not noticed in these collections of money that the Methodists have resorted to means which we would have to call sinful and unworthy. The money was not raised by fairs, bazaars and lotteries, from which especially the Romans know how to raise large sums, as for example again at the Catholic St. Elizabeth Fair in Philadelphia, of which a change sheet writes: "About eleven o'clock on the 23rd of December the great wheel of fortune was brought on the stage, and after the band had played a few pieces, the drawing began with State Senator Berkelbach asking a lady unknown to him to come on the stage and draw the numbers. She was blindfolded and drew the coupons.

the wheel. Among the valuable prizes was a house worth $5000, fully furnished (No. 1844 N. 23rd St.), which was won by a Mrs. Longmore. Other prizes were: a first class excursion ticket to Europe, a $400 piano, a diamond ring, 10 tons of coal, parliamentary furniture, etc. Father Donnhege announced that the receipts were $31,000 and the expenses $6000."

F. B.

Of the liberals in the Episcopal Church, F. W. Freemantle, Dean of Ripon, in England, Prof. Sanday of Oxford, and Dr. Heber Newton, in New York, have especially attracted attention of late. Newton, who has now accepted an appointment to Leland Stanford University, is, as the "Literary Digest" boasts, "a priest of liberal faith," "an apostle of universal religion," who has the success of the "Religious Congress" at heart, and who has sympathy with Christian Science, Theosophy, and Spiritism. Freemantle attracted attention by his speech on "Natural Christianity" before the Churchmen's Union, in which he denied the miracles and especially the virgin birth and bodily resurrection of Christ. In the Guardian Freemantle repeats what he said in his speech. He says: In Christ alone is found the true nature of man. The purpose of Christianity is to lead the world towards the ideal of the natural. As far as miracles are concerned, Christ made no distinction between death and fainting, apparent death and hysteria. When Christ commanded his disciples to raise the dead, he had in mind something quite different from what is called in our scientific days the raising of the dead. Most miracles, he said, are the power of a strong character over persons with weak nerves. Much of what is reported to us as a miracle must be attributed to oriental exaggeration and unreliable reporting. The divinity of Christ is best explained by the assumption that the efficacy of the divine Spirit in all men was uniquely manifested in Christ. Redemption is the elevation of man to his ideal, his true nature. Election by grace is the calling of many before others, to become like Christ in working and suffering for their fellow men, etc. Of course there are still people among the Anglicans who protest against these teachings of Freemantle and others. But Freemantle remains in office, and he has no lack of comrades to publicly applaud him. Yes, what Freemantle presented in a popular way, others before him have taught "scientifically" at the universities, and still do so today, and that undisturbed. At a congress of Anglicans held in Northampton, Prof. Sanday of Oxford declared: "The miracles which are reported to us in Scripture as such are real occurrences. But it does not follow that what was once thought miraculous can still be considered miraculous. With the proper definition of miracle, the problem of miracle will disappear. It is only a question of how to harmonize ancient and modern ideas." - Ritualism and rationalism are the gaping wounds in the body of the Episcopal Church in England as well as in America. F. B.

Immersion. The "Sendbote", the journal of the German Baptists, writes of 26 November: "Some time ago Prof. Rauschenbusch told one of his classes in Rochester that in Germany among theologians it was taken for granted and had long been proved that baptism had originally been administered by immersion; and that this was only sometimes denied in England and more frequently in America, partly because there is not so much historical scholarship as in Germany, partly because the historical truth is not so impartially known.

and partly because one has to struggle much more with the Baptists in this country than in Germany. To put this to the test, Prof. Rauschenbusch randomly assigned to each member of the class a work by an important German theologian of the regional church, asking him to find out whether anything was said in it about the form of the Tause, and if so, to copy it exactly and verbatim. The result was that not a single passage came to light where anyone claimed that baptism was administered by John the Baptist or the apostles by sprinkling or sprinkling. If anything was said at all, it was always by immersion. . . . The time is not far distant when American infant Anabaptist preachers will cease to claim that the apostles watered or sprinkled their baptized." A similar grandiloquent tone is carried on by other Baptist papers, e.g., "The Baptist and Reflector." They pretend that it is a foregone conclusion that the apostles used exclusively the mode of immersion, although they cannot point to a single passage in the whole New Testament from which it is irrefutably evident that John or the apostles immersed. The Baptists also continually distort the actual status controversiae. For they present the matter as if the point of controversy between Lutherans and Baptists were whether immersion or sprinkling was required. This either-or is false. We Lutherans teach precisely according to Scripture that every mode of contact with water is baptism, that Scripture has prescribed no particular mode, and eo ipso has left every mode free, nay, that we cannot even ascertain what mode or modes the apostles made use of. In the same number of the said paper, the following is communicated of the missionary conference held at the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church in Cleveland: "From a report . . . revealed the deplorable fact that 257 churches in the State of Ohio reported not a single baptism during the past year, and against 170 churches each reported less than five baptisms. Said committee will send a letter to every church in the state urging the churches to pave the way for a great revival from God by united prayer, earnest effort, and united cooperation. 257 churches in a single state not a single break in a whole year! How humbling!" - These exceedingly sad conditions undoubtedly have their reason in large part in the Baptist heresies of holy baptism, and at the same time form the main reason why at the present time many Baptists are practically as well as theoretically throwing overboard pieces of their former doctrine of baptism. Up to now Baptists have held that immersion was necessary for admission into the church, and they have denied communion to all who were not immersed. That this position is no longer held by many, however, is evidenced by the recent Baptist convention. At the same meeting the question was discussed whether immersion is "the only door to the church"? Four representative Baptists were appointed to treat this question in a lecture, without first having consulted each other. The result was that the four speakers came to the conclusion "that baptism is not essential to church membership. And the congress itself applauded the speakers. The sad thing is, of course, that here again the baby is thrown out with the bathwater.

F. B.

Socinianism in the sectarian churches. In the "Presbyterian" a pastor writes that he heard many sermons on his vacation trip, but none, in

The "Presbyterian" remarks: "The complaint is growing louder among serious Christians that the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ has disappeared from modern preaching. The Presbyterian notes: "The complaint is growing louder among serious Christians that the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ is disappearing from modern preaching. Christ, his teaching, and his life are still preached, but the cross of Christ is no longer emphasized as it once was. It is therefore no wonder that the pulpit has lost its spiritual and saving power. The reconciling blood of the Saviour is the glory of the preaching office, and must always be kept in view by a true and faithful preacher." The question, "What is religion ?" is thus answered by Lyman Abbott in the "Outlook":- "Religion is the art of living, nothing else-living with the hands, the feet, the eyes, the palate, the conscience, and the reverence. Religion is the life of the whole man.... What is religion? Reverence for God, loyalty to God, consideration for the rights and welfare of your fellow man. - But I have done none of these things; rather, I have broken his covenant. How can I bridge the gap between me and God? Do right, love mercy, walk humbly with God, do to others as you would have them do to you, have compassion and pity on the suffering and the sinner, and return to the fellowship of God and walk with him in humility and reverence. And what else? Nothing else; that is all." - This is summa summarum of the sermons not merely in Unitarian, but in numerous Protestant pulpits. F. B.

"**The Rationale of the Service of the Saints.**" This is the title of an article in the papist paper, "The American Ecclesiastical Review," from which the "Literary Digest" quotes. In it the assertion that the service of saints is a "remnant of pagan polytheism" is rejected as a slander. The Roman paper writes: "If we honor our fellow men for their natural gifts, and recognize in them special piety and perfection, we do not thereby deprive God of His honor, reverence, and service. Rather, we honor the Giver in his gifts. . . . With the same right might one be accused of idolatrous dishonor to God when he gazes raptly on a lovely landscape, the red of the sunset, or the melting of a flower." - The Papists represent the matter to Protestants as if their worship of saints were ordinary reverence and nothing more. And the salty "Literary Digest" spreads this representation without a word of criticism or factual correction. But it is a fact that the Romans pray to their saints, expect help from them, not only in all kinds of physical needs, but also in the great misery of sin and death, and turn especially to Mary, that she may mediate between them and Christ. To pray in this way is to blaspheme God and Christ as unkind and merciless tyrants, and to ascribe to Mary and the saints the divine attributes of omniscience, omnipotence, and omnibenevolence, together with the divine works of salvation from the distress of the body, soul, sin, and death. This is ungodly, irrational, and pagan polytheism. To what lengths the papists go, especially with Mariolatry, the innumerable Marian prayers and hymns bear witness. The "Katholische Monatsschrift zur Belehrung und Unterhaltung" (Catholic Monthly Magazine for Instruction and Entertainment) calls Mary in a recently printed song "the immaculate bride of God", "sweet refuge for us sinners". The song then concludes with the words, "Through thee, O heavenly gate, let us go to bliss." In Omaha, a Jesuit-as reported in the Evening Bee there on December 1-declared in a "Marian service", "While we most earnestly repel the charge of adoring the Blessed Virgin, we plead guilty of the greatest veneration for her. We pray to her for her intercession for us in life and death."

According to this, the papists do not "worship" Mary, but they pray "to" Mary in the distress of death and sin. As if such prayer for salvation in life and death were not the highest form of worship! Luther therefore rightly counts the worship of the saints, which erases the "knowledge of Christ," among the "abuses of endchristianism. He writes in the Schmalkaldic Articles: "And although the angels in heaven pray for us (as Christ himself does), so also the saints on earth or perhaps also in heaven, it does not follow from this that we should call upon the angels and saints, worship them, fast for them, celebrate for them, say mass for them, offer sacrifices, endow churches, altars, worship, and serve them in other ways, and hold them to be helpers in need and divide all kinds of help among them and assign to each one a special one, as the papists teach and do. For this is idolatry, and such honor belongs to God alone. Now when such idolatrous honor is taken away by the angels and dead saints, the other honor will be without harm, indeed, it will soon be forgotten. For when there is no longer any hope of benefit and help, both bodily and spiritual, they will leave the saints in peace, both in the grave and in heaven. For in vain, or for love, no one will much remember, respect, or honor them." (Muller, p. 305.)

F. B.

Of the colleges and universities in the United States, the New York Observer says: "It is evident that the State University-Jdee is a later idea in America, and not a happy one, unless the spirit of religion pervades such institutions, which, we would like to believe, it does in some cases. The State Universities are not ecclesiastical, but they permit religious work to be carried on among the students in a quiet, voluntary, and thoroughly unofficial manner. It is absolutely desirable that the 360 Christian institutions, which are such according to their foundation and according to every right of tradition and usage, remain such. They will not, however, retain their Christian character in the true sense of the word, unless every generation which has to direct these institutions is earnestly anxious that religion and morality should be the foundation of their instruction and conduct." Dr. Harris counts 480 such institutions, of which 360 have been founded by ecclesiastical communities. The state should only concern itself with the entire school system to the extent that it has to, if only for the reason that it cannot provide religious instruction in its schools, nor, on the other hand, is it able to keep unbelief out of them, as experience teaches. The church alone is able to do both. The fact is, however, that in many cases it does not do this, but opens the door to evolutionist science even in its institutions.

F. B.

State and Freemasonry. It is reported in the press that the cornerstone of the "Army War College" is to be laid in Washington on January 22 according to the ritual of the Freemasons, and that the President and his Cabinet will take part in this celebration. But as no President has the right to mix State and Church, so much less State and Masonry. Our nation and government is not Protestant, not Catholic, not Jewish, but also not Masonic. That the dedication of a public building with papist, Jewish or Masonic ceremonies is incompatible with the complete separation of church and state and the religious freedom and equality in our country should not have to be said, at least not to our highest officials. Yes, if God does not "preserve our country unabridged in its freedom," - our "great men" and politicians, who in many cases do not even know how to distinguish theoretically between State and Church and State and Freemasonry, will not do it.

F. B.

Anarchy and Tyranny of Unions. In Schenectady, the Local Union of Painters expelled a member and forced his discharge by the employer because he had served in a company of the state militia on the Hudson Valley railroad to maintain public order. This act of the local union is a slap in the face of the state and says that the union claims the right to commit acts of violence and does not want to be hindered in this by the state. This is anarchy. - President Eliot of Harvard University gave a speech on labor unions in Boston some months ago. In it he pointed out the following injustices of which the unions are guilty: 1. the arbitrary limitation of the number of apprentices, 2. the determination of how much the individual worker may produce per day, 3. the demand that the worse worker be put on an equal footing with the better one with regard to wages, 4. the acts of violence against scabs and employers, and 5. the intimidation of the police, the courts, and the press by the boycott. - In the Pennsylvania coal strike, several churches were also boycotted. During the strike, a number of preachers had sided with the mine owners and advised people to go back to work. In Lansford four of the six churches are under boycott. The members of the unions are forbidden to attend these churches, and anyone who shows up to worship in them is called a "scab." In Summit Hill this boycott has forced four pastors to resign. F. B.

II. Abroad.

At the Lutheran Conference for the Province of Brandenburg, the following guiding principles were discussed concerning the unification of the Protestant regional churches of Germany: "I. The unification of the Protestant regional churches of Germany - this is a building pleasing to God, and much longed for by all living Protestant Christians. II. The builders. For decades the most diverse master builders have been working on the realization of this building: 1. church-political master builders; 2. ecclesiastical master builders: a. the Evangelical Federation, b. the Eisenach Church Conference; 3. professional master builders, the synods; 4. princely master builders. III. the building condition. The maintenance of the independence and the confessional status of the individual regional churches is expressly guaranteed. IV. The building plans. I. A German national church - that would be a tower of Babel! 2. a German evangelical imperial church - that is a building plan from the land of Utopia. 3. a constitutional Protestant church federation - that would be a very daring, highly dangerous construction. 4. a powerful further development of the Eisenach Church Conference - that seems to be the only feasible plan at present. For only in this way will the confessional status and independence of the individual Protestant regional churches be truly preserved." - Scripture forbids any ecclesiastical fellowship with false believers. Let the German theologians, therefore, rack their brains at once, - they will not discover a permissible mode of the much-discussed ecclesiastical union. F. B.

At the General Assembly of the Evangelical Federation at Hagen in Westphalia, attention was also drawn to the following facts: The former priest Bourriers is at the head of the Los von Rom movement in France. In the last six years about 800 priests have left. Of these, II became pastors, others teachers, advocates, journalists. The present Prime Minister Combes wore the cassock for ten years. Many of those who left

Priests have become freethinkers. In Lorraine there were about 400 Protestants at the end of the 18th century, about 4000 in 1870, against 496,000 Catholics. Today Lorraine counts 40,000 Protestants, with the military 60,000. Since the war of 1870 15 parishes have been newly founded and 17 churches have been built. Father Th. Fliedner from Madrid reported that six new members were excluded last Easter. There are over 400 children in the Protestant school and 40 pupils in the orphanage, which is housed in the former home of Philip II. To Austria the Federation has so far sent out 80 vicars. In Belgium, the country of unrestricted priestly rule, where there are 18 times as many hostels as there are elementary schools, a Los von Rom movement has been in progress for 60 years. Of those who have left the church, about 20,000 have been won to the evangelical faith. Sixty years ago there were only 10 Protestant houses of worship in Belgium, today there are already 150. - The Protestant Federation has set itself the goal of combating Rome, and in this negativum quid alone also exists the unity of the same. It has probably 100,000 members, including many pastors (also confessional), professors and teachers. Unfortunately, liberal theology rules in the Evangelical Federation, and many of the vicars sent to Austria are infected by this theology. F. B.

Baumgarten in Kiel. Almost all theology students in Kiel have addressed the following to Prof. Baumgarten, the denier of the resurrection and ascension of Christ: "We members of the theological faculty in Kiel feel the need to give you the following explanation in view of the attacks made against you. We all gratefully confess to having received warm and profound suggestions from you as a religious personality founded in Christ. Those of us who know themselves to be your disciples in their theological views have the urgent need to thank you most sincerely also for the suggestions on this side. We are all of the opinion, however, that your teaching is not a danger to us, but on the contrary forces us, through your criticism of the conventional, to examine all positions and to make our own decision in the battle of views, on whose independence you place the greatest value; we are not served by an artificial protection from the influence of modern science! Therefore, we all unite in the promise that we want to prove our gratitude by always defending your person against unjustified attacks of any kind. The most effective proof of our gratitude, however, is this: We will endeavor to follow your example in the application of all our energies to the profession and in striving for religious determination and sincerity." The professors in Kiel also declared their support for Baumgarten. As a counter-demonstration against the petition of the 193 pastors they elected Baumgarten Rector of the University. The "A. E. L. K." comments on this: "One will hardly be surprised. That a large part of the professors have fallen out with the faith of the church is known anyway."

F. B.

The outcome of the Boer War. "The psalm-songs"-we read in a change-sheet-"of the valiant Boer warriors have died away, their religious battle-songs and battle-prayers have fallen silent, like their shouts of command, like their unfailing rifles, for peace is come! But what peace! The pious, God-fearing little people who faced their oppressors in unshakable confidence in God, who certainly had right on their side, more than ever a warring people, the people in whom faith, the spirit of prayer, was so alive that at the beginning of the war one could exclaim: If there be a righteous God in heaven-

mel, then this people must become the victory! - this people is defeated, vanquished, half destroyed! And how is it defeated? Heroically fighting, but abandoned by all the world, betrayed, crushed by twentyfold superior force, praying, hoping, believing!" - Unbelieving papers and scoffers have drawn from this fact the conclusion that it is not right but force that triumphs, because there is no God. Ecclesiastical papers, too, have asked: "Can there be a just God who permits such a thing, who lets a little band of his faithful, who cried out to him day and night, perish in his misery in such a cruel way? May mammon triumph over the fear of God, are all psalms, all prayers sung in vain, prayed in vain? Is there no one above man who hears them and has mercy on the supplicant?" Now in the Theodiceans, to which these questions have given rise, it has been justly pointed out that God dwells in darkness, and that his ways are not our ways; that he will find the unjust victor in his own time; that he has also punished the Boers for their injustices done to the negroes, etc. - From what we have read of the prayers of the Boers, and many intercessions for them, we have been struck with the want of submission to God's will. Political liberty and national independence, though a great thing, is after all an earthly good, for which Christians are to ask with the well-known double condition, If thou wilt and it is good for us. But the freedom of the Boers has often been asked for as if it were a matter of eternal blessedness itself, as if the one thing the Boers need is independence from England. But this is a dangerous error and testifies to a worldly Christianity. God has most emphatically pointed out this error to the Boers and to all Christendom by the outcome of the war in South Africa. And that, too, is theodicee enough. F. B.

"**Babel and Bible.**" As Frederick Delitzsch, in his lecture (also delivered before the German Emperor) on "Babel and the Bible," led his audience behind the light, Ed. König thus states: "The lecture gave a rambling exposition of the Babylonian account of the. Beginning of the World. Listeners and readers alike must have had the involuntary impression that this epic of creation in cuneiform scripture contained a highly important conception of the beginning of the world. But if only the speaker had quoted at least the first six to eight lines of this Babylonian text! Then listeners and readers would have got an idea of the real nature of the matter. Listen to the following! 'When above the heavens were not yet called, below the firmament, the earth, was not yet called, Apsu, the ocean, the very first that produced them, and the primeval form Tiamat, who gave them all birth, mixed their waters together; ...' when of the gods^ 'not one had yet come into being, no name had been named, no branch of destiny had been determined, 'then the gods were formed, then first came into being^ 'Lachmu and Lachamust Had these lines been presented to the listeners of the lecture, then they would have recognized that the Babylonians did not merely pay homage to polytheism, but even let the gods come into being in the process of the world. Then they themselves would have concluded that the Babylonians' conception of God was quite low and by no means approached the idea of God in the Old Testament. According to him, the divine spirit existed before matter, conceived the wonderful plan of the world, and carried it out of his own free will. Listening to a few lines of the real text would have rendered ineffective the words of praise which the speaker bestowed on the Babylonian account of Creation. But the cuneiform creation epic has been praised several times in 'Babel and Bibest. Thus, for example, with the words: 'There follows a Lord-

liche Scene.' But the speaker has omitted, among other things, Marduk's address to his father: 'If' really as your avenger Tiamat shall cope and save you, then gather yourselves together and make excellent my fate namely, 'when you sit together joyfully in Upschukkinaku, may, when my mouth opens, I determine the fates in your stead! ...' So Marduk took a reward first before he took on the fight. And the other gods? Well, they gave him the reward only after they had become intoxicated with joy at his willingness to fight. Thus it is expressly said, -The sweet must perverted their minds. By drinking themselves intoxicated, they swelled their bodies. They became very weary, and they determined the fate of Marduk, their avenger.' After they had prepared for him a princely chamber, he settled down opposite his fathers for kingship, and they said: -You are now the most honoured of the great gods. .. .' Of this, then, there is nothing in Delitzsch's 'Babel and the Bible.' On the other hand, he attributes the unmythological nature of the Old Testament's depiction of the Creation to the 'timidity of a priestly narrator'. For we read: 'The priestly scholar, of course, who wrote Genesis 1, was anxious to remove all mythological features from this narrative of the creation of the world'. So, what corresponds to the overall character of the Old Testament worldview, the sublimity of the Creator God over the mythological, that is attributed to the 'anxiousness' of a single class, if not a single 'anxious' individual!" If we are not mistaken, somewhere in a Prussian state document it says: "Science and its servants are free." Freedom to "science" includes this, that it can interpret and use cuneiform inscriptions as it pleases. F. P.

Brief News. Since New Year's Day, published by the New Orleans Pastoral Conference of the Missouri Synod, "The Southern Lutheran." It is a monthly paper, and costs 25 cents a year. The German local paper, "Evangelisch-Lutherische Blätter," however, is still published. - The "Lutheran" complains, "Why does the secular press insist on printing, instead of 'General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church,' thus or similarly, 'general council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church' ?" This is the penalty for giving oneself inappropriate names. The General Council is not presently a General Council of the Lutheran Church, never has been, and probably never will be. - Very well says the "Lutheran," "Many rich people seem to hold that the world need not be saved by the gospel as well as by human knowledge." Alas! this false opinion is not confined to the rich, but is common property to a puffed-up humanity. - The Unirt "Magazin für Ev. Theologie und Kirche" says in its advertisement of Cremer's writing "Gethsemane": "Cremer's main strength is his sharp logical way of thinking, comparable to the shearing knife, and, connected with it, an incomparably intimate deepness of mind. With the former he removes all that is erroneous, and then with the latter he approaches the positive answer to the question: What grieved JEsus to the point of death in Gethsemane? which he answers in such a way that it is the sin, now becoming a reality, of the conscious rejection of the Saviour by His people, which so depresses Him." Where is any of this in the text? According to the text, Christ mourns and trembles in view of the death that is coming upon Him, that is, because He stands in the place of men in the judgment of God, for death is the wages of sins. So Luther will probably be right in his interpretation of this part of the passion story to Prof. Cremer. "Sharp logical thinking" and "an incomparably intimate deep disposition" are of no avail in theology if one departs from the word. - The same

Blatt says, "The Union does not touch the confession of man or of the church." This is true in so far as the Union wants to leave fine "confession" to everyone. Only in doing so the Union lowers the "confession" to the level of human opinion. - Even in political papers people are now and then praised who do not want to hold church fellowship with everybody. Thus now and then the Episcopalians are accorded respect for refusing church fellowship to all non-Episcopalians. This, they say, shows "character" and "Conservative sentiment." Unionism itself has partly failed in the eyes of the world. One notices that nothing comes of it. But a Christian should not judge with the world in this matter either. He must not make a Christian virtue of the "conservative attitude" per se. The Episcopalians deny church fellowship to others on the basis of an error, namely, on the basis of their error of "apostolic succession," just as the papists deny church fellowship to non-Catholics on the basis of the satanic error of the divine foundation of the papacy. In short, "confervative mindedness" is good if it holds to the truth. "Conservative mindedness," however, is increased wrongness when it stubbornly asserts falsehood. - The "Presbyterian and Reformed Review," which for thirteen years was edited by Prof. B. B. Warfield at Princeton, is published from New Year's Day under the title: "The Princeton Theological Review." In place of Dr. Warfield, the entire faculty of Princeton Seminary takes over the editorship. Warfield held strictly to the inspiration of the Scriptures. Whether his colleagues take the same position will now be seen in the "Princeton Theological Review." -President Eliot of Harvard, in a lecture delivered before Methodist preachers, said that the Protestant church communions suffered from two errors. The one gave too much credit to reason, the other to feeling. In church journals, negotiations are now being held about the percentage in which understanding and feeling should be combined in a sermon. In order to find the right mixture, one points to the combination of oxygen and hydrogen in water. We fear that in all these calculations for the sermon nothing but - water comes out. If the preacher follows the basic homiletical rule: d τις *λαλει, ως λόγια &* *ε0ü*, 1 Petr. 4, 11. the right mixture of understanding and feeling will result quite by itself. - The "Lutheran World" gives the number of licensed drinking-houses in the great cities of the United States, and says in an appended Commentary: "Boston, with a much larger population than Cleveland, has only about half as many drinking-houses." This is certainly an advantage which Boston has over Cleveland in a civic respect. Drinking-houses, as they are conducted in this country, are certainly a curse to the country in a civic respect. But Boston is in other respects a greater curse to our country than many cities put together. This is the Unitarian "Boston Literature," which is flooding our country, namely, in the form of juvenile writings. Some years ago a president of an Eastern "college" complained to the undersigned that the Boston Unitarian youth literature circulating in the institution was making Christian education in the institution almost impossible for him. - The "Old Faith" reports: "Professor D. Julius Kaftan in Berlin is moving further and further away from his famous faculty colleague Harnack. His latest treatise on the 'Essence of Christianity,' which we encounter in the monthly journal 'Deutschland,' provides new evidence for a fact that has been known for some time. Here he speaks out very energetically for the fact that faith in Jesus Christ belongs to the essence and not to the shell of Christianity. We only emphasize the final sentence: 'As there is no

Christianity exists without faith in the personal God, so also not without faith in JEsus Christ: faith taken in the full sense that what is the object of faith belongs together with God and is not of this world.'" That Kaftan really "departs" essentially from Harnack we can only believe when he has abandoned his search for the "new dogma" and confesses unequivocally Christ's eternal deity and Christ's substitutionary work of redemption. - The "Old Faith" (Leipzig, December 26, 1902) brings up many things that do not agree with the old faith. He says, for example: "In the historical person of JEsus Christ the pre-worldly 'Word' became flesh. That is clearly attested by Scripture. The how will always remain a sacred secret. The possibility, however, lies in the fact that man who has become temporal is created for eternity and the community of God. God is immanent in his creation. Man was created in his own image by him and for him. Thus man, in his truth, must also be capable of grasping within himself the eternal 'Word,' whose incarnation must have been in God's plan from the beginning." What is said here about the "possibility" of the incarnation of the Son of God is worthless and in part misleading human thought. The fact of the Incarnation is quite sufficient. But nowadays one is so bent on rationalizing that one cannot deny oneself the opportunity to demonstrate "possibilities" to God and the church, and to explain the miracles, including the "great mystery," after the fact. - The "Sächsische Kirchen- und Schulblatt" reports from the German Colonial Congress: "An interesting conversation between a Saxon clergyman and the representative of the St. Benedictine Missionary Society is mentioned. The latter asked: The Protestant pastor: 'What do you understand by that? Surely the faith in the eternal, only-begotten Son of God?' Benedictine: 'Yes, sir.' Pastor: 'I can assure you of that of all, as far as I know them, with the exception of the next speaker' (that was D. Kind, chairman of the General Evangelical Protestant Missionary Association). The Benedictine was visibly satisfied by this information to know himself at one with almost all of us on this fundamental dogma; as he said of himself and his own, and also of us, "We must preach 'Christun.'" But the Romans do not preach "Christum" at all in the Scriptural sense. To preach Christ is to preach Christ's merit, to the exclusion of man's works, as the ground of salvation. This the Romans do not do. Therefore one must not admit that they preach "Christ" according to 1 Corinthians 2:2, etc. - The "Reichsbote" advises the Bonner Stiftsinspector Weinel, who in his lectures has denied Christ's divinity, miracles, resurrection, and substitutionary work of atonement, to go over to the philosophical faculty. This advice only makes sense under the condition that the philosophical faculty is to be made a "dumping ground" of fools. If we were a member of the philosophical faculty, we would vigorously forbid such an addition. But perhaps one is not allowed to do so over there.- From a legal member of the Hanoverian Consistory the "Ev. Kirchenzeitung" reports the dictum: "Our pastors(!) shall yet become so tame that they eat out of our hand." They are already so, even if they now and then utter sounds of displeasure. F. P.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 49. **February 1903.** **No. 2.**

Recent Pentateuch Criticism. 1)

By way of introduction.

Biblical criticism is one of the catchwords of modern theology, indeed of the whole of modern times. In almost no other field has so much work been done in the last 150 years, so many new things established, so many old things rejected, so many struggles and disputes fought out, as in the field of so-called biblical criticism in the broadest sense, as in the question of the Holy Scriptures, of their origin, their nature and their history. It has therefore been called with preference the past nineteenth century the "critical century," and modern biblical criticism calls itself with emphasis the Critique. Neither is true or accurate. There were times long before our day that could well have rivaled our own in sharpness and depth of criticism. And it would be much more correct to call our time not the "critical," but the "skeptical," the doubtful time, and modern criticism should not be called biblical, but "negative," the negating or unbelieving criticism. For it has quite a different standard, adopts quite a different procedure, and arrives at quite different results from the true, biblical criticism of our fathers.

But is there a true, permissible biblical criticism at all? The name has, of course, fallen into disrepute through the modern-critical mischief, and it is a fact that today's biblical criticism mostly only criticizes the Bible. And yet even here the wrong use does not cancel the right use. There is a right biblical criticism, which actually means nothing else than "examination, evaluation, decision. Criticism is an examination in order to separate the true from the false and to determine the true from the false.

1) The following statements were the subject of the proceedings of the Pastoral Conference of the State of Missouri in October, 1902, and are here presented, with some modifications and additions, in accordance with their resolution.

to ascertain the truth of the matter. And such a procedure is also permitted, even required, with respect to the external origin and history of the Bible as it is now before us, if it remains within the right limits. Our ancients wrote whole books on Biblical criticism: Calov his "Criticus Sacer Biblicus," Aug. Pfeiffer fine "Critica Sacra," J. G. Carpzov fine "Critica Sacra," Bengel his "Apparatus Criticus Novi Testa- menti," and others more. In such a work, the excellent Dannhauer justifies the necessity of Biblical criticism with the following words: "Satanas could not do away with the whole of Holy Scripture; but he could sprinkle weeds among it, cast doubt on the real writers, substitute spurious ones, could corrupt, mutilate, ... change the readings, separate what belongs together and unite what must be separated, and thus make the understanding of Holy Scripture intricate and difficult." 1)

In particular, Luther made many statements on biblical criticism and practiced such criticism himself. As is generally known, there are two parts of biblical criticism today, the so-called lower and the so-called higher criticism. Lower criticism is concerned exclusively with the external text of Scripture, examining its nature and endeavoring to restore the true text where the original form of the text has been lost, for which reason it is also called word or text criticism or external criticism. Higher criticism, on the other hand, is concerned with the author, the origin, the authenticity and credibility, and the canonical validity of a holy scripture, for which reason it is also called book criticism or historical or literary or internal criticism. About both areas of biblical criticism Luther repeatedly expressed himself occasionally and intentionally. When, for example, he says of 1 Petr. 4, 6. "Whether the text comes to us whole, or whether something has fallen out, I do not know" (IX, 1086); when he remarks on the difference in the numbers 30 and 20 in 1 Chron. 24, 3. and 26. he remarks: "The Hebrew Bible seems to have been falsified here; for otherwise 20 is written everywhere" (VIII, 1719); when in Apost. 13, 20: "After that God gave them judges for four hundred and fifty years", he declares the number 450 to be a mistake of the copyists (XIV, 600. VIII, 1852), and even in his German Bible of 1541 he puts the number 350 instead of 450; when in his marginal gloss on Joh. 18, 15. he says: "Here should be verse 24; it is displaced by the scribe in the overturning of the page, as often happens" (VIII, 1849): so these are all statements in which Luther acknowledges the justification of textual criticism.

1) "Codicis sacri totam substantiam e medio tollere Satanas non potuit, potuit autem zizania aspergere, veros auctores in dubium vocare, nothos sub stituere, corrumpere, mutilare,.. . lectiones variare, dividere conjungenda, conjungere dividenda atque sic intelligentiam Scripturarum Sacrarum intri catam facere ac difficilem." (Hermeneutica Sacra, Art. VI, § 1, p. 118.)

and claims. And when Luther makes his well-known statements about the so-called deutero-canonical books of the New Testament, for example, when he says of the Epistle to the Hebrews that "this epistle to the Hebrews is not St. Paul's, nor some apostle's" (XIV, 126); when he says of the epistle to St. Jude that "no one can deny that it is an excerpt or copy of St. Peter's other epistle" (XIV, 131); when he distinguishes the Apocrypha in the Old Testament, which for a millennium had actually been counted as part of the Bible, from the canonical books of the Bible. Peter's other epistle" (XIV, 131); when in the Old Testament he distinguishes the Apocrypha, which for a millennium had actually been counted as part of the Bible, from the canonical books, because they "are not held equal to the sacred Scriptures"; when he says of the Book of Job: "It is possible and probable that Solomon made this book; for it is almost his manner to speak thus in the same Book of Job as in other of his books" (XXII, 1415): these are all statements which strike into the region of so-called higher criticism. And yet Luther is, with our older theologians, far different, fundamentally divorced, from the present-day, justly infamous higher critics. Luther's highest and last principle was: Scripture says. And where Scripture speaks, the matter is decided, even in matters of biblical criticism. When the Saviour speaks in Scripture: "Moses wrote of me," John 5:46, Luther is certain: Moses wrote of Christ, and the book that goes under Moses' name is not a pseudonymous work, pieced together from half a dozen or a dozen source writings, as is generally asserted today. When the Lord says, "Abraham was glad that he should see my day, and he saw it, and rejoiced," John 8:56, Luther certainly holds that Abraham is a historical personage, and not a legendary figure, as nearly all the now prevailing school of liberal critics maintain. For the holy Scriptures are God's infallible word, and every word of Scripture must make the world close to one. This is Luther's and the Lutheran teachers' settled final axiom, this is the only correct, Lutheran, Christian, Biblical position. Instead of many, almost innumerable sayings of Luther that belong here, let us quote only one word in which Luther comes to speak precisely on questions of historical criticism and lays down his principles. He says in the preface to his Chronicon of 1541: "There is less to complain about Eusebius, who was indeed, as Jerome writes, an admirable and very careful man; about all other historians we complain, and they themselves complain among themselves that they have no basis for the exact calculation of the years. Therefore I have set these aside, and in this work have wished to take principally from the sacred Scriptures this calculation of years, on which we can and ought to base ourselves certainly and reliably." "I base myself solely on the holy Scriptures. Therefore I am also compelled to reject Philo, however unwillingly. . . . This matter has moved me, that, though I have not altogether despised the historians, yet

...preferred the scriptures to them. I use them in such a way that I am not forced to contradict the Scriptures. For I believe that in the Scriptures the true God speaks, but in the histories good men according to their ability show their diligence and faithfulness (but as men), or at least that the copyists may have erred." (XIV, 487. 490 f.)

From this principle of Luther and the old Lutheran theologians, the entire modern biblical criticism has deviated, not only in fact, but also in principle. Ever since the free French Catholic Richard Simon, in his infamous "Critical History of the Old Testament," published in 1678 and confiscated soon after its appearance, which the much-named Wellhausen, of course, calls "one of the most tasteful scholarly works ever written," 1) established the hopeless principle that the holy Scriptures are to be treated in the same way as the writings of profane writers, this has become the principle of biblical criticism that every modern higher critic accepts: Sacred Scripture is not God's inspired Word, it is not infallible and without contradiction, it cannot and must not decide critical questions. It is itself subject to criticism by science, by history, and by reason. Strack, a well-known Old Testament critic of the present day, who is regarded as positive, once expressed this in this way: "Against the use of the New Testament citations" (namely, to prove that Moses wrote the Pentateuch), "we must protest ... since by that use the controversy is transferred from the historical-critical to the dogmatic field." 2) And the Ritschlian Johannes Weiß, one of the newest New Testament critics and contributor to the new editions of the well-known Meyerfchen Commentary, not long ago added that "in the creation of the Gospels the most human and natural methods prevailed, which have not the slightest thing to do even with the tamest doctrine of inspiration." 3) And what the Holy Scriptures, the Word of our God, must put up with from these principles of the wicked modern critics, how they are treated worse and in fact more contemptuously than any secular writer has ever been treated, we will visualize in one piece, namely, the so-called higher criticism of the Pentateuch. We will first briefly see what the Scriptures say about the author and the origin of the five books of Moses; then we will show us historically to what positions the higher criticism of more recent times has arrived, and

1) "Introduction to the Old Testament" by Friedrich Bleek. Sixth edition, procured by J. Wellhausen. S. 2.

2) Herzog-Plitt, "Realencpklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche". Second edition, XI, 441.

3) Harnack-Schürer, Theologische Literaturzeitung, 24, 9.

Finally, let us consider a number of objections that have been raised against the Mosaic version of the Pentateuch. On the second point, we will then see that Harleß was not wrong when he characterized modern biblical criticism in his "Sprüchen und Glossen" (Proverbs and Commentaries) almost forty years ago thus: "What does biblical criticism mean? Tearing unsewn garments, praising scraps as a whole, In mending doll tailor's ways Here soon stop, there soon wear, What to our rails is not fit, pull together, What is fit, with iron, thread and seam weld together, What in our brains may shriek, Bright realities call, What does not go in everyday circles, From as pipe dreams point, Sick stomachs then promise This ragout as good to eat, And finally before art skill itself break the neck - That is called biblical criticism. 1)

L. F. (To be continued.)

A study of the death of our Lord on the cross.

(Continued.)

Christ has reconciled us to God through his death, he "died for our sins according to the Scriptures"; his suffering and death is, of course, only one side of his work of redemption, his vicarious fulfillment of the law is just as necessary for our redemption. The obedientia passiva includes the obedientia activa; 2) precisely in suffering he proved his obedience, he was "obedient - xxxxxxx - even to death on the cross", Phil. 2, 8. "Mors Christi est velut ultima linea ac complementum, τέλος, finis et perfectio totius obedientiae, sicut apostolus inquit

1) From Life in Song and Saying. By G. L. Adolph von Harleß. S. 127 f.

2) It is one and the same obedience according to which Christ fulfilled all the righteousness of the law for us, and according to which he suffered and died for us, "Passio Christi ejusque . . . impletio legis non sunt duae distinctae *species* obedientiae, quarum una absque altera . . . justificare possit, sed sunt unius obedientiae distinctae *partes* simul coeuntes ad constituendum unum integrum, quod cum amissione unius partis perfectionem suam simul amittit." (Gerhard, Loc. de Justif., § 63.)

Phil. 2:8. . . . Plane xxxxxxxx est, activam obedientiam a passiva in hoc merito separare, quia in ipsa Christi morte concurrit voluntaria illa obedientia, et ardentissima dilectio, quarum prior Patrem coelestem, posterior nos homines respicit." (Gerhard, Loc. de Justif., § 55.) Christ was perfectly sinless even in the suffering of death; he was inwardly obedient in the same, with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his mind; his death was a voluntary sacrifice; voluntarily he, the sinless God-man, became like his brethren in this, that he assumed mortality and took upon himself to die. "Because the Lamb of God offered Himself as a priest, because Christ made of His suffering a deed, the greatest, most glorious deed of obedience, because He ... suffered and died so gladly, so willingly, therefore his sacrifice was so sweet and acceptable to God." (Stöckhardt, "Passionspr." II, p. 29.) JEsus Himself emphasizes His willingness to die Joh. 10: "I am a good shepherd; a good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep.... And I lay down my life for the sheep.... Therefore my Father loves me, that I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to let it go, and I have power to take it again. Such a commandment have I received of my Father." His dying was an exercise of His power, His *I'ζχυσί*. Heb. 10:5. ff. the apostle writes, "When he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifices and offerings thou didst not desire; but the body thou hast prepared for me. ... Then said I, Behold, I come; and in the book it is chiefly written of me, that I should do thy will, O God. ... Then said he, Behold, I come to do, O God, thy will. . . . In which will we are sanctified once for all by the sacrifice of the body of JESUS CHRIST." God prepared the human body for Christ his Son, that he might present it for an atoning sacrifice; this counsel of God he gladly and willingly executed, and in this will, that is, in this willing obedience, we are sanctified and reconciled to God. That the death of Christ occurred in consequence of the divine counsel does not contradict the voluntary nature of his death; both are true: the Father gave his Son to die, and the Son was forced to die by his own love. The voluntary nature of His death is indicated by the announcements of His death to the disciples 1) and by many circumstances in the history of the Passion, e.g., that Christ allowed Himself to be bound, although He had previously struck His executioners to the ground, that He refused to let Peter strike Him with the sword, although He could have sent the angels to deliver Himself, His spurning of the intoxicating drink, the circumstance that He did not, as the mockers urged Him to do.

1) Who had heard the word, We go up to Jerusalem, and all things shall be accomplished. . . . They shall scourge him, and kill him," Luc. 18, 31. ff., they could not think that their Master was hurried to death against his will.

and how he might have descended from the cross, 1) the content of his last prayer on the cross, 2) and the fact that he spoke this prayer with a strong voice. 3) "Since our dear Lord Jesus Christ is lifted up into the air and hangs on the cross, separated from the earth, and no longer has anything of his own on earth, he is in his right, proper, priestly office, and accomplishes his work, for which he came on earth: not only with his suffering, that he offers himself, but also with prayer. For both are priestly works: sacrifice and prayer." (Luther, Hauspost., XIII, 1806.) "To this man death, though it came with all the accompaniments of horror, was not a surprise nor an interruption, but the very work which He came into the world to do. He foretold His own death in all its circumstances. . . . What shall we say of Him who from the beginning saw clear before Him that cross upon which He was to be lifted up, and who, instead of mourning over that cross as the symbol of the extinction and defeat of all His hopes and works, gloried in it as the sign under which He was to conquer and to lead His followers on to victory." (Nicoll, from an extract in the "Theol. Quarterly," III, 382.)

Because of this obedience, because of this willingness in suffering, the sacrifice of Christ was pleasing to God. It would not have been an injustice on God's part to accept a forced sacrifice, 4) but an involuntary sacrifice would not have been a perfect sacrifice, it would not have been pleasing to God, and therefore it would have been an insufficient sacrifice. The typical sacrifices in the old covenant, in order to be successful for the sacrificers, had above all to please God; therefore the words recur so often in Leviticus: "That it may be pleasant to the Lord," "So it will be pleasant and make atonement for him," "This is a fire for a sweet savour to the Lord"; 5) on the other hand, the prophets urge the people only to refrain from their sacrifices, because it is a vain effort.

2) "Qui de cruce descendere noluit, de sepulcro surrexit. Plus fuit mortem resurgendo destruere, quam vitam descendendo servare." (Gregory the Great.)

3) "Father, I commend my spirit into thy hands"; he himself surrenders his soul. On the subject of death, one of the ancients (Sedulius) says: "Thou comest not to Christ, but Christ cometh to thee."

4) *Φωνήσας φων-ῖι μεγάλη* - "he cried with a loud voice," Luc. 23, 46. (Cf. Matth. 27, 50. Marc. 15, 37.) The ancients found in this a proof that the Saviour's dying was not according to the course of nature, on overcoming weakness, but on His own free resolution. "Quod Christus statim, ut altum clamorem edidit, moritur, id ostendit ipsum voluntate spontanea mori; qui enim in ipso mortis limine tantas naturae vires in clamore exercuit, is etiam a morte seipsum praeservare potuisset." (Gerhard.)

5) We could at least not prove that from Scripture

6) 3 Mos. 1, 3. 4. 9. 13. 17. 2. 2. 9. and many more.

The Lord is not pleased with their sacrifice. Everything depends on the fact that the great sacrifice of Christ was pleasing to God, and the voluntary nature of this sacrifice was necessary for this. Jesus Himself says, "For this cause my Father loveth me, that I lay down my life," John 10:17; and by His willing obedience Christ purchased the love of the Father for His sacrifice and for us. The apostle writes in Eph. 5:2, "Christ loved us, and offered himself for us a gift and a sacrifice, a sweet savour unto God." 2) God was pleased with Christ's sacrifice because he offered himself, because he offered himself freely. "This is the right reason to know well Christ's suffering, when not only his suffering, but his heart and will to suffer are known and understood. For he who looks at his suffering in such a way that he does not see his will and heart in it, must rather be frightened by it than rejoice in it. But if one sees finely his heart and will in it, it gives right comfort, confidence, and delight in Christ." (Church Post., XI, 526.)

The sacrifice of Christ was acceptable to God, and it is the attitude of God toward this sacrifice that is important, for Christ offered this sacrifice to God, his Father, and not to the devil, as Origen and some of the church fathers after him taught. The devil has no right to demand a ransom from sinners. "Soli Deo, non diabolo λητ<> υ^ persolvendum erat." (Quenstedt.) Luther says that when the devil reproaches him, "Martin Luther, thou art a great sinner," he replies, "Thou hast no right to hold that against me." To the old serpent the Christian may say, "Wilt thou reproach me for my sinning? Where hath God commanded that my judgment of me I should take from thee? Who hath given thee power to condemn others, when thou thyself liest sunk in the flames of hell?" (Song 370:3.) And again the Christian saith unto God, The devil hath no power over me, I have but sinned against thee, who forgivest sins. What doth Satan presume upon him, who can give me no law?" (No. 410, 6.)

When we say that Christ offered Himself to God, by God is meant the holy Trinity; the penal justice of God, which demanded the ransom, is the One justice of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, therefore it must be said that Christ offered this sacrifice to Himself, His divine justice. According to 2 Cor. 5:19, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." The reconciler is at the same time the reconciled. So also the apostle Col. 1, 20. writes, that "all things through him were reconciled unto himself . . . so that he might make peace through himself by the blood of his cross". The peacemaker is at the same time the one party that is reconciled with another party.

1) Isa. 1, 11-15. Amos 5, 21-23. a.o.

2) "Τώ θεώ ε'ις οσυήν ενωδίας^ is the same expression which in Leviticus. often occurs according to the LXX.

is expiated. Against a false interpretation of Grotius, Calov writes on this passage, "Non minus Filius quam Pater offensus erat per peccatum, et inimicus factus humani generis. Opus ergo erat, ut ad ipsum reconciliatio etiam pertingeret." There is comfort in the truth that the very same one who paid the ransom is also the recipient. "Quomodo non accipiet pretium, quod persolvit ipse?" (Gerhardt, Med. Sacr., X.) „Ipse Deus sibi reconciliavit mundum, ipse Deus fit Mediator, ipse Deus suo sanguine humanum genus redemit. . .; idem, "qui offensus erat, ... fit reconciliator." (l. 6. XV.) For the reconciliation of God with men, Christ offered Himself in death to God as a sacrifice; the reconciliation of God with sinners, on whom fine wrath lay, is the fruit of Christ's death. Char Friday is the great day of reconciliation of God with men. As the death of Christ is an accomplished, divinely authenticated fact, so the reconciliation of God to sinners is an accomplished, divinely authenticated fact, for "we are reconciled to God by the death of his Son," Rom. 5:10. The apostle writes 2 Cor. 5:19: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their sins unto them." The "reconciling" and the "not imputing sin" is an act of God, and this act has long since been performed, forming the greatest datum in Biblical history, in the history of the great deeds of God. "Now as a strange guilt in Adam hath all mocked us, so a strange mercy in Christ hath all reconciled us; and as by Adam's fall we all died eternal deaths, so by Christ's death God hath reconciled that which was corrupt." (Song 236:3.) By faith man's reconciliation with God is not effected, but the reconciliation made by Christ's death is accepted. Because the objective reconciliation is already present through Christ's death, therefore only faith is necessary to the subjective reconciliation, for in believing we receive that which was already present before faith, as the apostle Rom. 5:11. testifies, "By whom" (our Lord JEsum Christum) "we have now received the reconciliation." Our righteousness was purchased when Christ suffered and died on the cross; by faith we appropriate this righteousness to ourselves; faith is putting on the garment of Christ's righteousness. "The highest righteousness is acquired unto me, when thou diedst on the stem of the cross; the garments of salvation have I obtained, wherein my faith doth shine for ever." (Song 249:6.) By the death of Christ the world is reconciled to God, all men, not merely a selection, and every individual man, not merely mankind in general. This was God's purpose; according to John 3:16, God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son; if the gift is to prove God's love to the world, it must be meant for it.

1 Tim. 2, 6. The apostle writes of Christ, that he gave himself for all to be redeemed - - ά^τίλυτρον υπέρ πάντα"; it is a ransom,

The first thing that was said was that it was a thing that could apply to everyone in terms of its value, and that it should apply to everyone in terms of its destination, both to the one who presented it and to the one who received it. Note the connection of this passage. We are to pray for all men (v. 1.), because God wills that all men should be helped (v. 4.); for the One Mediator between God and men (v. 5.) has given Himself for salvation for all (v. 6.); and this is not to be hid, but "preached in his time" (v. 6.), for which purpose Paul (as he solemnly affirms v. 7.) is set apart to be apostle, preacher, and teacher of the Gentiles. In God's eyes Christ is "the Lamb slain from the beginning"- άπυ καταβολές = from foundation-"of the world." "Fructus passionis Christi extendit se ad praeteritum et futurum tempus, unde veteres dicunt: .,Christi passio profuit, antequam fuit.'" (Gerhard, Loc. de Elect., § 122.)h „Etsi suo tempore peractum est sacrificium, valet tamen ad omnia tempora, ante et retro." (Dannhauer, Hodos., p. **688.)** 1 John 2:2. the apostle writes, "The same is the propitiation ... For the whole world - περϊ ολ<> υ του χόσρ,ου - sin." "At this 'xxxx' all predestinatian sophisms fail, according to which by world, the ecclesia electorum per totum mundum (so Augustine), or those are supposed to be signified, (ui simul crediturі erant et qui per varias mundi plagas dispersi erant." (Philippi, Glaubensl. IV, 1, p. 100.) Bengel remarks that the word "world," even where it stands alone, embraces all men, e. g. Cap. 4, 14 ("Saviour of the world"); who would now take the liberty, in this place (2, 2.), where the word "whole" is prefixed, to understand by "world" less than all? Cap. 5, 19. the apostle says, "The whole world lieth in trouble." And Bengel now, comparing the two Proverbs Cap. 2, 2. and Cap. 5, 19. he sets up the proposition, "Quam late patet peccatum, tam late propitiatio" As the whole world lies in trouble, so the whole world is reconciled by Christ's death. This is a fine argument; thou canst convince thyself from thy sin that Christ died for thee also. Rightly understood, thou mayest rejoice in thy sin with that old Father of the Church, and say, "O blessed guilt, that deserved to have such a Redeemer!" With Paul Gerhardt the Christian sings: "If I had not the guilt of sin upon me, I would have no part in thy mercy; in vain wouldst thou be born to me, if I were not in God's wrath." (Song 46:17.) The generality of the atonement through Christ's death, as taught here, must not be weakened, or rather denied again, in such a way as to grant to Christ's atoning sacrifice only a power sufficient for the expiation of all sins, but in fact only a limited power.

1) Cf. Walther, "Evangelienpost.", p. 107.

number of sinners to be redeemed by the same. "Even Calvin admits that the distinction between the sufficientia and efficacia of Christ's death does not fit our passage (1 John 2:2). It is precisely the efficacia of Christ's atonement that is important to the believers who are challenged for their sins. Now should the apostle utter the nonsense that Christ died efficaciously for our sins, the sins of believers, but died not for our sins, but for the sins of the whole world, if not efficaciously for the latter, yet sufficiently?" (Philippians, I. c.) 1) Just also those who are finally lost are really and truly redeemed by Christ's death. Rom. 14, 15. writes the apostle, "Beloved, spoil not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." The apostle means to say, How dreadful it would be if by careless conduct thou shouldest bring another into hell, whom Christ was about to bring into heaven by his death. The same thought is expressed in 1 Cor. 8, 11. 2 Pet. 2, 1. The apostle says that Christ also bought those who deny him and bring upon themselves swift condemnation. From Heb. 6 we see that Christ was crucified also for those who commit sin against the Holy Spirit and so perish. The doctrine that Christ died for all is not contradicted by the statement that he laid down his life for many, Matt. 10:28. Heb. 9:28. The whole often forms a great multitude; even the Calvinist Rivetus writes: "Universalitas est quaedam multitudo." All that are in the graves shall come forth in the day of resurrection, Joh. 5, 28. f.; but because this is a great multitude, therefore the Scripture expresses it thus, "Many that lie asleep under the earth shall awake," Dan. 12, 2. All the carnal descendants of Adam became sinners through his fall; but because Adam had many children, the apostle writes, "As through one man's disobedience many became sinners, so also through one man's obedience many become righteous," Rom. 5:19. Isaiah says in one place, "We all went astray.... The Lord cast all our sins upon Him", but in another place in the same sense: "He bore the sins of many", Is. 53, 6. 12.

The death of Christ was a full sacrifice, which God could accept according to his strict and merciless justice. God, according to his goodness, was not satisfied with the atonement of Christ as an inferior ransom, as it were a part payment, and did not accept it instead of the full payment, but the death of Christ was a full atonement for all the sins of all sinners. "We are bought with ransom," 1 Cor. 6:20. We are "bought with ransom.

1) It would be a poor consolation to all the poor of a city to say to them, "A kind man has come who is rich enough to help all, but in fact has decided to give to five of you."

"We are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of an innocent and spotless lamb," 1 Pet. 1:18, 19. Our cleansing from sins has been effected by the blood of the Son of God, 1 John 1:7. "Christ's flesh and blood is as valid as He Himself is valid." (Luther.) "It is certain that Christ's death is a satisfaction not only for guilt against God, but also for eternal death, as clearly the saying of Oseä is: 'Death, I will be thy death.' What abomination is it, then, to say that Christ's death is sufficient for guilt against God, but the chastisement which we suffer delivers us from eternal death?" (Apology, Müller, p. 193.)

Christ's sacrifice is more than sufficient. "The debt of man is not paid simply, nay, tenfold, a thousandfold. We are not plucked out of the fire as with scarce need; the grace of redemption is an abundant grace." (Stöckhardt, "Passionspr.'", Anh., p. 43.) The believing heart sings, "Yea, what more shall I ask? The flood of grace washes over me." (Song 249, 8.) It is an oversight on Graul's part, when, in his little book on the "Doctrines of Distinction" (p. 37), he declares the following proposition to be a false doctrine of the Roman Church: "Christ, as true God, is infinite: therefore also his merit is infinite, and therefore more than sufficient to redeem the sin-guilt of men, which, after all, is only finite, since sinning men are themselves finite beings." Graul continues: "On the other hand, notice that if we want to act with mere reason, the matter can just as well be turned around and said: sinful men are indeed finite; but God, against whom they sin, is infinite, and therefore also their guilt is infinite." It is true, of course, that we can neither measure the greatness of our sins nor the value of Christ's sacrifice by reason. In this Graul is right when he writes further: "Let us, however, remain quite simply with the Scriptures, from which we learn in the most certain way that Christ is 'the propitiation for our sins and for the sins of the whole world' (1 John 2:2), and therefore that His merit is perfectly sufficient for all men's sins," but in this he fails to add: "While not a single passage is found from which it can be inferred that it is more than sufficient. Such passages are found in Scripture, for when the apostle writes, Rom. 5:20, "But where sin has become mighty, grace has become much mightier," he teaches that the fullness of grace and redemption not only outweighs, but outweighs the multitude of sins. Of sin he says, "ί-λεόνασε," it heaped itself up, the measure of sin became ever fuller, "sin abounded"; but of grace he says, "τερετερίσ-.

1) Lat.: "Quid est igitur *monstri*"; it is indeed a monstrum, an inconsistent thought, a monster, to suppose that through Christ's death we are freed from guilt, but not from the consequence of this guilt, from eternal damnation.

σευχτεχ", it has become supersized, "much more powerful", "grace did much more abound". „Paulus dicit, gratiam exuberare supra peccatum, hoc est, misericordiam ampliorem esse quam peccatum." "Paul saith, Rom. 5:20: let grace be mightier than sin, that is, more powerful, more abundant, and stronger." (Apology, p. 113.) "Quantum scintilla se habet ad mare, tantum hominis malitia ad Dei clementiam. Pelagus tametsi magnum est, mensuram recipit, Dei vero clementia finem non habet." (Chrysostom, cit. in Calov's Bibl. III. ad Rom. 5, 20.) The same thought underlies 2 Cor. 3's exposition of the glory of the Gospel. Because Christ's merit is the content of the gospel, therefore it not only shines as brightly and clearly as the law, but it is of exuberant clearness. The law, which exposes us to sin, curses us, and punishes us, is "not to be regarded for clearness against this exuberant clearness." - It is, of course, an abuse of this doctrine, contrary to Scripture, and in addition quite senseless, when the Roman Church claims for itself the right to sell this superfluous merit of Christ, and thus to remit to penitents the imposed ecclesiastical satisfaction. It was the refutation of this presumption that Graul had in view. But Papal abuse must not prevent us from holding fast to the comfort of the Gospel, that Christ has done and suffered more than enough for us. "Ideo enim personam mediatoris oportuit Deum et hominem esse, ut obedientia et passio ipsius esset aequi valens, sufficiens, immo superabundans λύτρο" pro peccatis nostris." (Cpenu ntft, Examen IIII, 83.) „Clamant ad coelum peccata mea, sed fortius clamat sanguis tuus pro peccatis meis effusus, Valida sunt peccata mea ad me coram Deo accusandum, sed validior est tua passio ad me defendendum. Injustissima vita mea potens est ad me damnandum, sed justissima vita tua potentior ad me salvandum. " (Gerhardt, Med. Sacr. I.) „Plus in Christo recipimus, quam in Adamo amisimus; abundaverat peccatum, sed superabundavit divina gratia.u (1.c., Med. XV.) Br. B.

(To be continued.)

The present struggle in the field of Assyriology.

(Conclusion.)

The often-mentioned Assyriologist, Prof. Dr. Fritz Hommel, also shows in his writing: "Die altorientalischen Denkmäler und das alte Testament" (The Ancient Oriental Monuments and the Old Testament), that the evolutionist theories of Wellhausen in the Bible criticism, according to which the Jahvereligion and thus also Christianity is supposed to have worked its way up from a kind of fetishism and

The German Bible is not supported by Assyriology, as Friedrich Delitzsch tried to show in "Babel und Bibel" (Babel and Bible). Of the sensation that Delitzsch caused with his work, Hommel says: "Unfortunately, Germany does not belong, like England and America, to the 'Bible countries', as Delitzsch (p. 4) has said too sanguinely; if it did, the enthusiastic surprise that Delitzsch's lecture has caused among so many would be completely incomprehensible. For, with the exception of a few bold and, what is more, unprovable statements (such as, for example, what was said on p. 47 about the Babylonian veneration of Jahve), Delitzsch has for the most part presented things that have been known for a long time, and which he has brought close to the physical eye by means of photographs. If our popular Bible encyclopedias, such as the well-known and not at all expensive Calwer 'Bibl. Handwörterbuch', were in everyone's hands, then the knowledge of the ancient Orient, insofar as it is accessible and comprehensible to laymen, would be far better. If, on this side, Delitzsch's lecture, as thankful as his skilful compilation is, has caused a sensation and shown many a world that is completely new to them, then this is actually at the same time a testimony of poverty for our Christian circles". (p. 5.) After deducting several bold assertions, Delitzsch has not brought forward anything new, especially no new facts. This is also true of the assertion, which caused the greatest sensation, that the name of God "Jahve" is of Babylonian origin, since it is found on ancient Babylonian tablets from the Hammurabid dynasty, which was contemporary with Abraham. On this Hommel remarks: "Also in their (the Hammurabidynasty) name system names occurred, like Jahvi-ilu, what however not: 'Jahve is God', but: 'God exists'. I discovered this interesting name in his time from old Babylonian tablets of that epoch and also explained it correctly, while Delitzsch uses my find, but interprets it in a quite impossible way. Also the other name, which Delitzsch mentions on p. 47 and which Prof. Sayce in Oxford first found, is not called Jahvi-iluJahum-ilu (which would again be: Jahve is God), but Jaum-ilu, which is: ‚Jau (= Ai, the moon) is God.'" (S. 11.)

Delitzsch claims to have provided evidence from Assyriology that the biblical prehistories were taken from Babylonian literature, which offers them to us in a purer and more original form, and that Israel inherited its laws and the best part of its religious views from the "Canaanites, who were at that time completely saturated with Babylonian culture". On this Hommel writes: "Delitzsch moves in his lecture, with only minor exceptions, entirely in the fairway of the common Enlightenment prevailing today in so-called scholarly Old Testament circles, or, in other words, of the modern rationalism borrowing Wellhausen's name. In many newspapers, then, there was a cry of triumph over this, and the circumstance was

to the fact that this pamphlet from the pen of a famous Orientalist caused such a 'sensation' and fortunately also 'doubts' with deeper minds. To many, the temple-tumbling statements of the newer ones about the Old Testament were, after all, only a learned hypothesis, but now a large part of them should be directly confirmed by the Babylonian-Assyrian monuments." (p. 6.) "Since the end of the seventies, when Wellhausen took the then living young generation by storm with his captivating diction and beguiled them with his false historical-philosophical system, one must no longer speak of 'Moses and the prophets' in the words of Jesus, but of the prophets and only then of the law, that is supposed to have been the true historical consequence. The fifth book of Moses is a forgery from the time shortly before the reign of King Josiah, a pseudo-scripture foisted by a reform party for pious purposes and hidden in the temple, and only through the preparatory activity of the prophet Ezekiel is the great ritual codex, also attributed to Moses, supposed to have come into being in and after the exile, with which Ezra then made the Jews happy and which now constitutes the greater part of the second, third and fourth books of Moses. It is then simply a consequence of this conception of history, which turns the whole Old Testament history upside down, that the primeval stories (Gen. 1-11), as already mentioned, are borrowed from the Canaaneans during the period of the Judges in a still polytheistic form derived from the Babylonians; that the patriarchal narratives originally represent myths which likewise previously adhered to purely Canaanean cultus; and that, finally, the core of what is told of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, of Moses, and of Sinai, is at best a saga." (S. 8.)

According to Hommel, however, the inscriptions are not only not for, but against Wellhausen. He writes: "It must be emphasized here immediately with all emphasis that the inscriptions do not lend any support to such an arbitrary, even if wittily executed historical construction, let alone that any monumental testimonies from antiquity demand the same. From several sides, the assumption has been voiced that Delitzsch had still unpublished texts in the background or at least texts that were not yet available to the public in translation, because he takes the above-mentioned point of view as a basis with such certainty. However, this is not the case. On the contrary. There exists a whole series of inscriptional testimonies which veto such a rape of the biblical tradition." (p. 9.) "The more I have immersed myself in the mysteries of Oriental antiquity in all its ramifications, Babylonian as well as South Arabian, the more unshakably has the conviction been formed in me that the statements of Wellhausen's school (which, after all, put the priestly codex, because it was not yet active in the wildly turbulent time of the Judges, at the end) are consistently wrong.

These are only hypotheses resting on a materialistic-philosophical foundation, which up to now, wherever monumentally authenticated facts come into consideration, directly contradict them instead of being confirmed by them. In the end, however, even the most ingenious hypothesis must fail because of facts. Wellhausen, unquestionably the most important advocate of this hypothesis, has already been called the 'greatest historian of religion of the 19th century'. If one uses the term 'philosopher of religion' instead, I agree wholeheartedly, but at the same time I see the old experience confirmed anew that even the most ingenious system of philosophy of religion can, indeed must, go to pieces if, as here, it succeeds in measuring its propositions against 'brutal reality,' in our case the picture that emerges from the inscriptions on unbiased observation. Reality is 'brutal' only in so far as it ruthlessly cleans up the preconceived opinions; hence also explains the ever-increasing, almost fanatical rage of so-called modern criticism, which does not shrink from the most spiteful means when it is a matter of putting uncomfortable opponents under the spell and branding them as backward and unscientific. Let us not lose heart, then, when it is necessary to introduce a new era, that of facts instead of hypotheses, against the still prevailing current; after all, it is a matter of our most sacred possessions. May the Old Testament scholars, above all also the so-called half-men, who limp on both sides, finally free themselves completely from the evolutionist spell; with this wish I conclude. Surely it must be spring !" (p. 38.) "In what follows, however, I shall now show how richly the period before Joshua, from the days of Abraham onward, is illustrated and confirmed by the monuments, if one only allows the inscription-authenticated facts to have an effect on him, unprejudiced by any philosophy of history and unbiased. However, other monuments, which Delitzsch does not seem to know at all, also come into consideration, namely the South Arabian inscriptions." (p. 12.) 1) The famous Assyriologist, Professor Sayce of Oxford, agrees with this, when he writes: "I do not hesitate for a moment to affirm that, according to my knowledge, the researches in Assyria and Egypt thoroughly confirm the statements of the Old Testament."

1) Dr. Hommel also takes the opportunity to give his verdict on the meticulous differentiation of sources by the Wellhausenians, which reads as follows: "But one thing must be emphasized with all emphasis, namely, that it is vain self-deception to think that one would still be able today, in such a meticulous manner, to differentiate everywhere in the Pentateuch into three, yes, sometimes many more sources, as the Wellhausenians do and as it is marked, for example, in the translation of the Old Testament published by Kautzsch by the differentiation letters placed in the margin. In the translation of the Old Testament published by Kautzsch, for example, the distinction letters are placed in the margin. Sometimes one can say of whole chapters or parts of chapters that they belong to a more popular narrative, which always says Yahweh for God, and of other passages, again, that they belong to a more popular narrative.

But Hommel himself is not in the camp of the orthodox. He also knows how to talk about source separation, double reports and contradictions in the Bible. For example, he tries to connect Genesis 1 "with a lost, still well reconstructable Chaldean (not Babylonian) report". And he traces the so-called priestly codex back to the "primitively attested service of God, which already prevailed in Mosaic times in the land of Moses' father-in-law, in Midian. Hommel thus summarizes the results of his own criticism: "What now follows from all that has been said so far for the consideration and understanding of the first eleven chapters of the Bible? In summary, the answer is that the old view handed down to us by our fathers must be modified in many respects. According to the wording, these chapters do not originate from Abraham's days, a part of them, as we have seen, not even from those of Moses; but it is nevertheless the old Chaldean tradition from Abraham, which, though surrounded by human accessories, has been preserved here essentially as it then circulated in Chaldea in the circle of God-fearing patriarchs. The old orthodox doctrine of Jnfpiration must be abandoned forever, especially with regard to these chapters, but nevertheless a world separates us from the Auffaffung of the Wellhaufen School and Delitzsch. The Bible believers, too, have to relearn in many respects; the biblical text has gone through a long history until, approximately in the time between Ezra and the Greek translation of the Septuagint, it took on the form that is before us. There can be no question of revelation down to the letter, and double reports, contradictions and later misunderstandings are not uncommon. But nevertheless the inheritance of the fathers from Abraham's time on has always been handed down with a reverent hand, and in the use of the congregation it has always been brought nearer to the understanding of the respective generations." (p. 34.) Like Delitzsch, Hommel also wants to understand and explain the Bible as purely naturally developed literature, although he resorts to less radical theories than Delitzsch's fine opponent.

What makes Assyriologists of Delitzsch's ilk completely incapable of passing a correct judgment on the relation of Assyriology to the Holy Scriptures is not only the basic evolutionist view corrupting all thinking to which they are devoted, but also the complete ignorance of the revealed religion presented in the Bible of the Old and New Testaments.

are taken from a more doctrinally referential report, where Elohim (‚Gotst) stands. But in many cases, where, moreover, it is often only a question of the dissection of individual verses, it is pure conceit to believe that it is still possible to make a distinction here." (p. 15.) "My view of the distinction of sources, the actual key of which I do not believe to have been found by any means, is therefore a very sceptical one, as I have already clearly expressed on several occasions." (S. 16.)

gion. Delitzsch's premise is that monotheism is the essence of Christianity. What is familiar to every Christian, namely, that Christianity is essentially the reconciliation and redemption brought about by Christ, the God-Man, is a deep-sealed secret to Delitzsch. He compares the Christian religion with the Babylonian religion and yet does not know what Christianity is! Without knowledge of Christianity, however, one can neither write a history of the church, nor correctly judge the events in world history, let alone the relationship of the Babylonian religion to the biblical one. We are interested in the present struggle in the field of Assyriology also for the reason that it is an example of how God usually arranges it so that the enemies of His Word must destroy each other themselves, and that with the very weapons with which they wanted to attack Christianity, so that Christians usually have not much more to do than to watch the strange spectacle. F. B.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

According to the statistics for 1902, which Dr. Carroll has again published in the "Christian Advocate," but which in many instances is based on conjecture, the Catholics number 9,401,798 communicants, 3 millions more than in 1900; the Methodists 17 distinct bodies with 6,084,755 members, 98, 184 members more than in 1901; the Baptists 13 bodies with 4,629,487 members, 48,654 more than in the former year; the Lutherans 22 bodies with 1,745,588 members, 49,320 more than in 1901; the Presbyterians 12 bodies, with 1,635,016 members, 30,001 more than the year before; the Disciples 1,635,016 members, with a gain of 27,836 members; the Episcopalians 767,334 members in 2 bodies, with a growth of 16,355 members; the Congregationalists 659,324 members, with a gain of 13,330; the Reformed 385,038 members in 3 bodies, with a gain of 8498 members. The increase in all ecclesiastical communions is: 720 preachers, 1261 churches, and 403,743 communicants. Gained: The Lutherans 2.9 per cent; the Disciples 2.3 per cent; the Episcopalians and Reformed 2.2 per cent; the Congregationalists 2 per cent; the Presbyterians 1.9 per cent; the Methodists 1.6 per cent; the Baptists 1 per cent. That the statistical data are generally still very unreliable is evident, for example, from the fact that the calendar of the General Council puts the increase of the Lutherans at 18,634, while the calendar of the General Synod puts it at 79,477. And where Dr. Carroll got the figure of 49,320 also remains a mystery. It is similar with his data for other communities. According to Carroll, the Congregationalists, for example, are said to have increased by 13,330 communicants. The "Congregationalist" remarks: "We are anxious to know how Dr. Carroll arrived at this result. Our own yearbook shows no such gain." By such advice, however, one is thoroughly put off statistics. The "Lutheran" believes that the evil can be remedied by the Lutheran statisticians, before they get to work on the

The first step would be to compare their figures before they go public. This would, however, make it less easy for the public to find out how unreliable the data are. The only way to remedy the problem is for all pastors who provide statistical data to actually count them. As long as the pastors are not able to do such exact work, the statistics are not very good. Of Catholic statistics Carroll says: "The Catholic Church has no system of statistics. Priests only report their baptisms and burials. From this information the bishops first calculate the number of souls, and 85 per cent of the number thus obtained are given as communicants." "The Catholic Directory" for 1903 counts 11,289,710 Catholics in the United States, 2.8 per cent more than the previous year, a little over one-seventh of the whole population. To these must be added 6,565,998 Catholics in the Philippines; 33,000 in Hawaii; 9000 in Guam; 593,243 in Porto Rico; sum total: 18,853,951, nearly one-fourth of the whole population. The hierarchy consists of 100 prelates (86 bishops, 13 archbishops and 1 cardinal), 9743 secular and 3222 regular priests. Churches have the Roman 10,878; universities 7; seminaries 71; colleges for boys 162, for girls 643; parochial schools 3978 with nearly 1,000,000 pupils; charitable institutions 1000. In New York alone the Catholics number 1,200,000 adherents, against 1, 163,911 Protestants and 650,000 Jews. - The fact that the Lutheran Church has proportionately increased the most of all the Protestant communities is certainly a gratifying one. But when one considers that there is still a not insignificant immigration, one cannot help thinking that the Lutheran growth from within is not as great as it might be, and that the losses to other church communities or to the world are not insignificant. Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, and other communions are still building themselves up to no small extent from Lutheran material. F. B.

English parochial schools. We reported in the last issue of "Lehre und Wehre" that the Pastoral Conference of New Orleans was publishing an English monthly, "The Southern Lutheran," in addition to a German paper. It is especially pleasing that immediately in the first number of the English paper the importance of the parochial schools is inculcated. After pointing out that children are to be taught from God's Word and educated with God's Word from their youth and onward in the parental home, it goes on to say with regard to parochial schools: "Although the religious training in the family is of the utmost importance, yet on account of the peculiar vocation and condition of families neither the religious instruction, much less a general education, can there be given exclusively to children. For this reason Christ gave His charge to the Church, 'Feed my lambs.' This charge she can fulfill only by maintaining good parochial or church schools for children. This duty can only rightly be discharged by means of Christian schools under her care. These parochial schools necessaTily differ, in their nature and aim, from the secular schools of the State. The Church alone has the divine commission to preach the Gospel and to educate and prepare men for good citizenship in the spiritual kingdom of Christ. To this His spiritual kingdom, the Church, alone has He committed the keys of heaven and the charge, 'to teach all nations and to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' Hence Christian or parochial schools must differ, in their nature and aim, from the secular schools of the State. Just for this reason are church schools such an indispensable necessity and the Church under such obligations to establish

and maintain them. Good schools and good teachers must he regarded as one of the most vital means for preserving the Church in her doctrinal purity and for promoting her growth and prosperity." F. P.

The Ohio Synod is reaching out to the General Council. That is the impression The Lutheran got from an article in the Columbus Theological Magazine entitled, "What Doctrines Justify Schism?" And the "Lutheran" declares, "Diefes clear reaching out to the General Council should not go unheeded. As far as we are concerned, we are ready to meet the same more than halfway." From the article in the "Columbus Magazine," the "Lutheran" first quotes a passage which answers the question why the Council is the point of union for the Lutheran Synods. In the translation of the Jowaschen "Kirchenblatt" it reads: "In conclusion, I am permitted to express the opinion that, on the whole, the General Council presents the most favorable opportunity for a unification of the Synods on the basis of the points discussed here. Here is not the Missourian spirit demanding submission in subordinate doctrines with almost Papal severity at the risk of being stamped a heretic. Both the 'Lutheran' and the 'Church Review' furnish proof that there is no lack of deep and successful investigation of Lutheran doctrine in this church body. Here the transitional period in the language question is happily passed, and an English Lutheran Church, founded on our unaltered and unadulterated confessions, has laid the sickle to a field, great in extent and promise." So first: because the Conciliar does not demand submission in subordinate doctrines as Missouri does; in other words, because the Conciliar advocates moderate unionism. Secondly: because the Conciliar had happily survived the transitional period in the language question (for example, by giving price to the parochial schools?!). - On the question of how to initiate union, the "Lutheran" cites the following passage: "The ecclesiastical situation seems to demand that representatives of both bodies open their hearts to each other, that they possibly send delegates, and best of all, that they hold free conferences, at which there is more prayer than battle cries. There have been conferences between Lutherans of different tendencies from which common prayer was forbidden. We do not know whether to wonder more at the blindness that expects good results when the one bridge that connects the two parts, namely, common prayer, is broken down, or at the uncharitable sense that refuses to admit into the community of prayer those who belong to the same community of faith and sincerely regret the rupture in the ecclesiastical community. What we need is less polemic, but all the more mutual debate that comes from the heart, an accommodating understanding of the difficulties from which others suffer, and a broader Lutheranism that receives its kind not from an individual or a school, but from the richness of truth and history that is our common heritage." According to this, the main breakthrough to unity should be a common prayer service: Prayer for unity before it is established. - In answer to the question, what belongs to true church unity, the following words are adduced: "In all things of which the word of God is silent, - absolute liberty. In all things on which God's Word has shed light, - Gehorfam against the light; on these terms, and no others, Lutherans may join hands with one another, and with such as were formerly strangers to our communion." This is the doctrine of the Synodal Conference, and every depreciation in defectu and excessu from this principle has punished it at the Conciliar and other Synods. This is also true before-

This is in perfect harmony with the Concordia formula, which demands agreement in all articles of doctrine for church unity. But it does not agree well with the unionist sentence quoted above about the "Missourian spirit, which demands submission in subordinate doctrines with almost papal severity. Now which of these two principles does Ohio intend to follow? As to the doctrines of the individual Synods, the "Columbus Theological Magazine" declares: the chiliasm of the Iowa Synod and the General Council, as well as the Lodge practice of the Council, is not an insurmountable obstacle to union. The General Synod, however, which treated the lodges as innocent associations, invited sects to Lutheran communion, and had its pastors preach on sect pulpits at synods, excluded itself from the union. But the General Synod was still open to progress in doctrine and practice, and therefore the hope of union with it was not entirely excluded. Missouri, however, was different. The "Lutheran" quotes: "With his crypto-Calvinistic development of the doctrine of conversion [which is all the more vicious because it renounces crude Calvinism] Missouri has left the historical foundation of our church. However shining a light Missouri may be to us with its sound practice and conservative stand against innovation, any other synod in our country offers more hope of unification than the Misfouri Synod. The dominant element of any other synod seeks to align itself with old landmarks and is therefore amenable to progress in all pieces of doctrine and practice. Missouri, on the other hand, requires us, as a purpose of union, to ignore the historical development of Lutheran dogma." - We will dispense with all the inconsistencies and untruths which are crowded into this sentence, and will only point out that this passage, too, is in contradiction with the principle that only deviation from sacred Scripture can justify the abolition of church fellowship. It expresses the idea that no union is possible with Missouri because it has left the historical foundation of the Lutheran Church and ignores the historical development of Lutheran dogma. According to the Columbus Theological Magazine, the standard for unification is not Scripture alone, but also the "historical development of Lutheran dogma.

F. B.

The "Lutheran Church Bulletin" of Reading writes in its issue of January 3: "From December 1 to 4, 1902, the 'Evangelical Alliance' was assembled in Easton, Pa. The opening was held in St. Paul's Lutheran Church of the D. Dr. Fischer, who also congreganted the meeting. The English Lutheran, P. H. C. Alleman, in the 'Lutheran Observer' (Dec. 26), gives a description of the meetings and the resolutions. There were over 60 delegates present: Baptists, Methodists, Congregationalists, Evangelicals, Free Baptists, Lutherans (General Synod and General Council), Mennonites, Herrnhuters, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Reformed, Reformirt-Presbyterians and United Evangelicals. The Methodist preacher, Rev. Dr. S. M. Vernon of Philadelphia, spoke on 'Soul-Winning,' and this subject became the 'key-note' of the convention. Resolutions were then adopted that a new 'interdenominational relation' be established among all the main church bodies. According to this, church members should be received into each church without being asked about their church polity or doctrine ('that no question of church polity or doctrine need ever arise'). These were drawn up by a Committee consisting of D. Dr. Richards (Congregationalist), D. Dr. Danna (Presby-

terian), P. Dr. Witman (Baptist), P. Dr. Albertson (Methodist), and P. Dr. Alleman (Lutheran). These resolutions were unanimously adopted. It was further resolved that Union services be held in the smaller towns and in the country churches throughout the State. The next annual meeting will be held at Reading, Pa." ... "If the 'Lutheran Observer' claims that Lutherans of General Convention attended, it will not have been many. But that the General Synod wholly and fully subscribes to these principles is well known, and the 'Lutheran Observer,' which has more readers than all the English Lutheran papers put together, takes this stand,Ed its readers agree with it. In this they boast that they adopt the Augsburg Confession as the doctrine of the Church! Besides these Union services, regular English Lutheran revival preachers, such as Uev. Dr. Sieber of Gettysburg, go through the congregations and convert, Methodist-style, the Lutheran (!) church members at the penitential bench just now in the winter time. A Christian parochial school does not exist, and confirmation classes are arranged in many places with a few lectures. To the Lord's Supper everyone who felt ,good is invited and the pulpit is changed right and left on Sundays and feast days. In the General Council a trait of unification has also made itself felt. Prof. Dr. Jacobs is the guiding spirit of this movement which seeks to unite the English church bodies of the Lutheran Church. Even a prize question was put by the editor of the 'Church Review' (Rev. Drach) a fortnight ago, whether or not the Lutheran church bodies should unite more closely. For years meetings (General Conferences), Diets, etc., have been held to more closely unite the English 1st in General Council, 2nd in General Synod, 3rd in the United Synod of the South. Joint labours were undertaken, such as liturgical formularies; and in recent times the direction of the General Council's heathen mission to India was given to a man of the General Synod. The latter that missionary authority, of which Prof. Dr. Jacobs is president. In 1866 things were different in the Lutheran Church. There earnest men met at Reading, Pa. and sought a Lutheran union on the basis of the Lutheran Confession. The Lutheran doctrine was then and for years thereafter considered, and the points that divide us and the points that unite us were discussed in church meetings and church bulletins. This was the first period of the General Council. A new generation arose. The old fathers are mostly gathered to their fathers: Pastors Prof. C. F. Schäffer, Prof. Dr. Krauth, Prof. Dr. Mann, Dr. Greenwald, Dr. Schmucker, Hoppe, Vogelbach, Darmstätter, Schmauk, Brobst, Wenzel, Gilbert, and others. Others, who used to talk and write with us, have become of a different opinion. Thus, at the Concil and in the Synod, a change of delegates has again been introduced, at which great speeches of admiration are held. A few years ago, Dr. Seiß, as a delegate to the General Synod, gave the present situation its proper expression. He told of the dog of the famous pulpit orator Bescher, who was allowed to go with him every year to the summer vacance. The first year he saw a squirrel in the woods, which he chased until it disappeared into a hole. He stood in front of the hole and barked. Every year the dog stopped in front of the empty hole and barked. Thus Dr. Seiß described the stressing of those confessional questions of separation between the Conciliar and the General Synod as a barking before the empty hole! That he did not miss the cheering applause need not be said here. The differences have indeed dwindled in English circles. The Luther League no longer recognized them. In English Sunday School associations they do not exist either. In the Pennsyl-

In the Second Synod of Denmark, an authority has been appointed which determines that in the places where the General Synod has begun a mission, no missionary congregation shall be started by the Pennsylvania Synod. - We confess that even in the Roman Catholic Church there are true Christians to be found, who, notwithstanding the erroneous doctrine of the Pabst, are saved because they believe in Christ. We also confess that there are true Christians in all denominations, whether they be called so or otherwise. But a 'church union' such as the Alliance at Caston seeks is not a God-pleasing one. To simply ignore all differences is dishonest. They are there, and they cannot be settled by such manoeuvres. We also know that there are fine men in the General Synod, and we hold in high esteem especially German men who have come to America in recent times and who are zealously carrying on the missionary work here. We also hope that they will keep themselves free from the English mishmash. But all unification through back doors is reprehensible. Let men meet and honestly discuss all points of Lutheran doctrine and practice, and thereupon unite."- The practical unionism in the Conciliar is occasionally defended theoretically. For example, the October issue of the Lutheran Church Review contains the following sentence: "The principle of segregation for purposes of protection is not a principle of Protestantism." This sentence is quoted by the "Lutheran World" in its issue of November 27 and justifies with it the open-conunion practice in the General Synod. The further position of the Conciliar on the symbols is evident from the January number of the "Lutheran Church Review," where it says: "No Lutheran professor or student is an entirely free man and investigator. He is free in Christ. He is also free within the bounds set down by the Church. He is also perfectly free to go outside of the Church bounds, but he is not free to take an antagonistic position outside of these bounds in public until he gives up the Churchl." To this sentence, according to which the Confession is norma docendorum, but not credendorum, for the one who signs it, the "Lutheran" of January 22 also professes. And how questionable the position of the "Lutheran" is with respect to the Bible is shown by the following passage from its number of December 18: "Moses says: God created the world. Science says: The laws of nature have evolved the world. There need be no contradiction between the two; they differ only in that science stops at nature, while Moses goes back to the God of nature." According to this, the "Lutheran" believes that he can reconcile the theory of evolution with Genesis 1. What might be the principles of his interpretation of Scripture? F. B.

In Search of a Name. The movement among Episcopalians to find a better name, and especially to erase the "Protestant" from their name, will not rest. They want to find a name that expresses that they, the Episcopalians, are the people, namely, the people with whom the church appears as it should be. The Episcopalians have still not learned that the proper manifestation of the Church is the pure preaching of the Gospel and the proper administration of the Sacraments. A part of the Episcopalians would especially like to soften the opposition to the Catholic Church. But in this respect, too, all efforts are in vain, as long as one does not want to come under the pope. On this point also Catholicism, which has been called the "modern," is adamant. Thus a few years ago an English Catholic reproached the Episcopalians with the fact that their church system was at best a "decent heresy" as long as one did not accept the pope.

F. P.

Methodist Doctrine and Life. "Spiritual Culture Society," is the name given to an association of Methodists, headed by bishops and professors. The purpose of this society is to hold meetings in seminaries and colleges in order to deepen the spiritual life of those who attend the meetings and to promote piety in families. But as a special goal is also stated: "restatement of spiritual truth in new forms adaptable to the thought of the age", in other words: interpretation of the Bible according to modern science. Originally the Methodists formed ecclesiolae in the corrupt English state churches. Now the Methodist churches are about in doctrine and life what the Anglican state churches were in Wesley's time. Hence the need for devotional associations within the Methodist churches. But if these associations are serious about the intended "restatement," they too will not work into the hands of piety, but into the hands of unbelief. - That unbelief is rampant among Methodists, however, is testified to by Dr. Sheldon of Boston Methodist University. In the "Christian Advocate" he writes: "Our interpreters of the Old Testament may differ in details, but it is well known that they all stand on the common ground of a critical view of the Old Testament. Doubtless, a considerable procent of our clergy still hold to the old theory; . . . but when we consider the progress of the new theology, it is precisely this which is on the winning side." In the doctrinal books of Methodism, he said, the verbal inspiration had been dropped. The doctrine of original sin was dying out. A large part of the Methodists had decided in favor of kenosis. The death of Jesus is often no longer regarded as an atonement, etc. - The best situation is still among the German Baptists. But even here unbelief is breaking through. In the "German-American Journal of Theology and Church, published by the Faculty of Nast Theological Seminary at Berea, Ohio," we read in an article, "The Struggle over Bible and Babel": "The Holy Scriptures nowhere say: 'Hold fast a certain dogma of inspiration, or a certain dogma about the age of the world, and test - nothing'; rather it exhorts: 'Test everything, and keep the best.'" "Here in America, many Bible believers, including individual pastors, judge one-sided professors from above, if they deal at all only with newer theology; he who holds tightly to the old is their man." "An ingenious Copernicus or Edison, in spite of their innovations, find recognition; an ingenious Delitzsch is suspected by many, as soon as he shakes old views. Do these people forget altogether that it was such learned men and professors as Gerson, Wickliffe, Hus, Calvin and Zwingli, Luther and Melanchthon, who initiated and carried through the Reformation"? These learned men delivered us from obsolescence!" "It cannot be denied that 'we find in the Bible two narratives of the Flood^ which, according to Delitzsch (and in this he is right), completely contradict each other." - So here, too, enthusiasm turns out to be gross rationalism. F. B.

Should church dignitaries hold state office? There has been much agitation in the church papers against the Mormon apostle Smoot, who is running for senator in Utah. He should be refused admission to the Senate because he is an apostle of the Mormons and because he places the power of the church higher than that of the state government in political matters. The "Independent" writes: "The main charge is that he recognizes in the Church a higher power than the Federal Government. So does every good man who has any religion. That argument has been used ad nauseam against Catholics." This is a rash judgment.

The position of the Papists and Mormons, who promise obedience to their ecclesiastical leader in civil matters, is not compatible with the sovereignty of the state and the oath of citizenship. And the reason why our State can support the Catholics in this respect is not that the position of the papists is justified or harmless, but that the papists do not assert it. So long as they confine themselves to theory, our state itself carries anarchists. But what is right for the papists is right for the Mormons. It is offensive, of course, in a country of complete separation of church and state, that an ecclesiastical dignitary should at the same time assume a secular office: that Smoot should become a senator and yet remain a Mormon apostle. But it is even more dangerous when, for example, the President appoints church dignitaries to all kinds of state offices, as has happened repeatedly in the past year. This is illustrated by the following passage from "Freeman's Journal": "The next meeting of the Roman Catholic
Bishops of the United States will be of particular importance. The Catholic Church has been recognized and favored by the President of the United States no less than three times on great occasions during the past six months. Archbishop Ryan was appointed a member of the Board of the Jndianercommission. From this Board Catholics had been excluded for many years. The Taft Commission in Rome was a direct recognition of the Catholic hierarchy, and now Bishop Spalding has also been appointed as a member of the Arbitration Commission appointed by the President to bring the coal miners' strike to a final settlement. That three such events could occur in so short a period of time indicates that the number, influence, and education of the Catholics are recognized. The reason is this: since the Catholic associations were merged into one organization or federation, the government has suddenly become aware that the Catholic Church has a large number of votes. " F. B.

Washington Celebration in the Sunday Schools. "The Sunday School Times" issues a call for the celebration of Washington in the Sunday schools, and at the same time lays plans as to how such celebration may best be held. Washington's obedience, self-control, zeal, self-confidence, courtesy, reverence, patriotism, courage, modesty, simplicity, purity of heart and mind, decency, truthfulness, and earnest Christianity are to be especially emphasized. At the same time, reference should be made to the great progress our country has made since Washington in the territorial, business, political and moral fields. - Without exaggeration, gross mixture of state and church, and obvious denial of Christianity, this celebration in the Sunday schools of the sects will probably not take place. A real Washington celebration is not everyone's cup of tea. F. B.

Decision in divorce matters. In Massachusetts, a father bequeathed property to "his son's wife." The son divorced his first wife in South Dakota, where he had resided for six months for that purpose (i.e., not bona fide), according to Dakota law. After the divorce, the son remarried. When the father died, the second wife claimed the bequest. The Massachusetts court, however, awarded the inheritance to the first wife as the son's sole lawful wife under Massachusetts law. There is, in fact, a statute in Massachusetts that persons residing in that state who go to another state to obtain a divorce shall not be recognized by the courts of Massachusetts as validly divorced. The Supreme Court of the United States, by five vs.

three votes upheld the Massachusetts decision, declaring the Massachusetts law constitutional. Of the 320,000 divorces granted in the last twenty years, how many have been declared null and void? So asks a bill of exchange. And the "Congregationalist" is indignant at "the low state of ethical sensitiveness and ordinary prudence which tolerates such conditions as now exist."F. B.

The large gifts and bequests. The "Inter-Ocean" of Chicago adds up that in the United States in 1902 $57,396,000 was given by 23 persons for charitable, church, and educational purposes. Here only the million-dollar gifts seem to have been counted. A number of other persons gave $20,001,067 in 1902. Here all sums under $10,000 are disregarded. Of these H77,397,067, educational institutions received $28,150,803, municipalities $4,869,700, museums and art galleries $2,888,000, libraries $4,970,800, charitable institutions $36,519,814. If money could eliminate misfortune and ruin, a little of the happy age should soon be dawning here in America. But the actual circumstances prove that money also belongs to the "herb" and "plaster" that does not heal. It has been said, "They that have money have no word of God, and they that have God's word have no money." Neither the one nor the other is quite true. Especially neither is the latter. Christians also have money, and as much as they need for their earthly and ecclesiastical occupations. But it is necessary to stop with instruction and admonition from God's word. F. P.

II. foreign countries.

The Breslau Synod and the Leipzig Mission. "The 16th General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Prussia held its sessions in Breslau from September 3 to 12. The important subject was the question whether or not the Lutheran Church in Prussia should continue to cooperate with the Leipzig Mission. The question arose from the fact that the Leipzig Mission had granted voting rights to the Lutheran Missionary Association in Frankfurt a. M.. Pastors Rohnert and Rocholl, and with them 24 pastors from the congregations to the west, that is, to Saxony, rightly saw this as a denial of the right confessional loyalty. These were, like the 'Neue luth. K.-Ztg.' published by pastors of the Breslau Synod, almost like a man for the break with Leipzig, 'about whose ruthlessness in practice against us in the regions there was much complained, since it considers our separations there (separirte Lutheran congregations) unjustified'. Thus Rocholl and Rohnert brought a motion, according to which the Leipzig mission must be regarded as no longer standing on a faithful Lutheran standpoint, and thus the break with Leipzig was made necessary. On the other hand, the Oberkirchencollegium, which presides over the Breslau Synod as the highest governing authority, brought the opposite motion, namely, to regard the admission of the Frankfurter Missionary Society as an exceptional case and not as a case of precedence, and to recognize the Leipzig Mission as fundamentally standing on a Lutheran standpoint, which means precisely the continued cooperation of the Lutheran Church in Prussia with the Leipzig Mission. The motion of the Oberkirchenkollegium finally passed by 85 votes to 32." A favorable report was given on the progress of negotiations with the Synod of the united Evangelical Lutheran congregations in Baden for the establishment of pulpit and communion fellowship. However, the planned reunion with the Immanuel Synod did not occur. A second set of pericopes was presented and adopted. F. B.

Association for the Preservation of the Seminary in Krapp. The "Kirchen-Blatt" "of the Canada Synod reports: "A long time ago an 'Association for the Preservation of the Seminary in Krapps' was founded in Germany, the members of which pay a certain contribution annually. Before Father Paulsen's departure for home, an agitation committee consisting of seven respected pastors of the New York Ministry has now come into being with the task of recruiting members for this association in our country as well. Whoever undertakes to pay an annual subscription of K1.00 is a member of the association and receives a share in the seminary property. All members of the association will be informed about the circumstances of the seminary through semi-annual reports and have the right to exert their influence on the internal and external management of the institution.

"**How pathetic is this ecclesiastical pettiness**" - so writes the "E. K. Z." in the interest of the unification of the Protestant regional churches of Germany - "which so firmly circumscribes the spiritual horizon, which so sadly suppresses the vital forces, which so painfully hinders the common labor of love! Must not this mutual cordoning off of the Lutheran Landeskirchen cling like a lead weight to the feet of German Protestantism, paralyze the joyful initiative, hold down the unselfish sense of sacrifice? Is not this division of the German Protestant regional churches a chief source of their weakness, impotence, and decrepitude? And how much more could German Protestantism accomplish if all the individual churches were united in holy labor of love, if they worked on the solution of the common tasks of life viribus unitis, if they resolutely opposed the forces of destruction that run riot against the foundations of our faith, if they confronted Rome, armed to the teeth, as a united phalanx! Truly, the unification of the Protestant regional churches of Germany-that is surely a goal pleasing to God and ardently longed for by all living Protestants!" - Such considerations are one-sided and for that very reason false and misleading. One gets the impression that outward cohesion is the highest good of the Church. And yet this is not the case. There is a higher good which the Church must preserve at all costs, even if it costs peace and outward unity. This supreme good of the Church is the truth of the Gospel. Certainly, the outward unity of the Church is also a great good. It is wrong to praise the divisions in Christendom as harmless, even as beneficial. But if the truth is to be told, God has commanded us to sacrifice peace and to take up the sword. And if a community becomes or remains small because it does not want to sacrifice divine truth for the sake of outward peace, this is something great in God's eyes and in the eyes of all those who act according to God's word. F. B.

The greatest crisis of the church in Germany. "The Protestant Church in Germany" - writes Stöcker in the "Deutsche Evang. Kirchenzeitung" - "is today going through the greatest crisis which it has ever had to face. The question for it is whether it will remain in the common faith of Christianity or not. If modern theology were to prevail with its denial of the divinity of Christ and the Trinity, with its denial of the supernatural birth and ascension of Christ, with its rejection of biblical eschatology, then it would be separated from the Church of earlier centuries and from the entirety of the Church." - So it stands, as Stoecker says. And the so-called believing and positive theologians are not equal to this crisis, because they no longer believe that we have God's inspired and infallible Word before us in the holy Scriptures.

F. B.

Friedrich Delitzsch gave a second lecture on "Babel and the Bible" on January 12, in the presence of the Emperor and Empress, the Chancellor of the Reich, Countess Bülow, Ministers Studt and Reinhaben, and many members of the German Oriental Society. In the same he is reported to have said, "There is no greater aberration of the human mind than the belief that the Bible is a personal revelation of God." "Apart from the revelation of God which every man has within himself, we need none." To the inquirer, the Bible is nothing but man's work, many times disputable man's work. The Decalogue and the rest of the legislation in the Pentateuch is of Babylonian origin. About 2250 before Christ, that is, about 850 years before Moses, Hammurabi had already given laws from which it is clear that the Mosaic laws were already known before Moses, that they were not a revelation, and that the religion of the Old and New Testaments was dependent on the Babylonian-Assyrian world. - The truth that men before Moses also made a distinction between right and wrong and expressed it in laws is familiar to every Christian child from the Bible and catechism. Delitzsch, however, passes it off as a great Babylonian discovery, and draws from it the conclusion that there is nothing wrong with the revelatory religion of the Bible. Delitzsch seems to know nothing of the fact that there is another doctrine in the Bible, namely, the Gospel, and that basically everything in the Bible, including the Mosaic laws, is intended to serve this doctrine. That is why he judges the Bible as a blind man judges paint. - The 282 provisions of Hammurabi's law, discovered in Susa by a French archaeologist and translated by Winkler, which are said to date from the time of Abraham and to which Delitzsch refers for his fine assertions, were also published in several issues of the "Independent" some months ago. There is no trace of the Decalogue in it. Individual provisions are reminiscent of Jewish laws, which is not at all conspicuous, since they deal with essentially the same questions (property, marriage, contracts, etc.). A conclusion on the dependence of the Jewish laws on the Babylonian laws cannot be drawn from this. The "Independent" does not believe that the laws in the Pentateuch originated with Moses; but of the Babylonian origin of the Mosaic laws he writes: "We are now in possession of the Babylonian laws, and can compare them with the Mosaic: but that the latter are derived from the former is most improbable." The difference between the two, he said, was too great. The Hammurabi code, for example, contains no provisions whatever on the Sabbath, sorcery, false weights, unnatural vices, treatment of strangers, usury, etc. According to the "Independent", what follows from the find at Susa is rather: "The assertion (Wellhausen's) can no longer be maintained that the Pentateuch contains an all too detailed legislation in order to belong to the Exodus period. A Babylonian code of laws has been unearthed in Persia which is almost a thousand years older than Moses. We can imagine the glee with which Sayce and Hommel will now pounce on their critics." This also agrees with the statement repeatedly made by Dr. Hilprecht, namely, that all the excavations made by him fully confirm the Biblical story, and those who have lost faith in the historical fidelity of the Bible will find it again in the desolate wastes of Babylon. Last month Prof. Hilprecht gave a lecture in Leipzig to a numerous assembly on the "Results of the American Excavations at Nippur." The "Kirchenblatt" of Reading writes: "His introduction formed the confession: in spite of all the masters who interpreted the Old Testament prophecies in his time in Leipzig", he had never received such a moving visual lesson of their full, un-

The entrance to the temple, however, was no different from the entrance to the entire presentation, which was bathed in the light of biblical prophecy. Not unlike the entrance, however, the entire depiction was bathed in the light of biblical prophecy. The curse of the prophet: 'How art thou fallen from heaven, O fair morning star!' echoed through the confused heaps of debris that flew out in word and image before the listener's eye. But it was almost more daring to oppose the windy hypothesis addiction of a Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch, and thereby to provoke the wrath of all critical minds in Germany. But Hilprecht did not hesitate to express his firm, unshakable conviction before the enormous assembly: When recently the attempt was made to derive the pure monotheistic conception of God of the Israelites from Babylonian sources, then I must declare this to be absolutely impossible on the basis of my fifteen years of study of the Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions. The faith of the chosen people is, "Hear, O Israel, the LORD our God is one LORD!" And this faith can never come from the Babylonian mountain of gods, that charnel house full of musty smells and dead men's bones.'" In Berlin, on January 17, Court Preacher Dryander held a meeting of Conservatives, at which Dr. Hilprecht repeated his lecture. Also present were the Minister of State, the Duke of Saxe-Coburg, the Duchess of Albany, and others. In Berlin, too, Hilprecht emphasized that it was nonsense to claim that the Jews had inherited their theism and pure morality from the Babylonians. It is now also reported that the Emperor invited Dr. Hilprecht to lecture before him and his trousers on the excavations at Babel. "Der Alte Glaube" says of Delitzsch: "His lecture on 'Babel and the Bible' has been so unanimously rejected by calm, expert criticism that he should find it difficult to refute the objections raised. It would be better, therefore, if he were to set about correcting his own scientific views, instead of creating new confusion in Germany by rashly popularizing highly questionable theories. We are accustomed to look down on North America as the land of business sensation. But when one compares Professor Dr. Delitzsch with his German-American professional colleague, Dr. Hilprecht, one involuntarily comes to the thought that the glory of German science, the clear, soberly weighing objectivity, is about to wander across the ocean. Hilprecht has quite different successes to Delitzsch to show. On the other hand, the public reports on the results of his excavations, which he recently presented again in various North American cities, were of a modesty, a restraint and an objectivity that one might well take as a model in Germany." That America is not averse to "scientific sensation" is evident from the fact that Pros. Delitzsch has been invited to come to America to give lectures on "Babel and the Bible" in Boston, New York, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis and other centers of science. 1) "Unanimously", says the "Old Faith", "Babel and Bible" has been rejected by the expert critics. Against Delitzsch have appeared, namely, e. g.: Cornill of Breslau, Nöldeke of Strasburg, Marx of Heidelberg, Jeremias of Leipzig, Kautzsch of Halle, Rabbi Barth of Berlin, König, Hom-.

1) The "Lutheran Herald" reports that Prof. Dr. Fritz Hommel will also come from Munich to America to give four lectures in various seminaries and colleges (also in Mount Airh) against the destructive criticism of Wellhausen. Dr. Hommel was formerly a Wellhausenian; his Oriental studies, however, convinced him of the complete untenability of this theory.

mel, Knieschke, Oettli, Strack, Kittel, etc. Among the numerous journals that have turned against Delitzsch is also the organ of the Ritschlians, "Die Christliche Welt. - The fact that the German Emperor once again attended Delitzsch's lecture in such a conspicuous manner is interpreted by various newspapers, probably not without reason, as a negative response by the Summus Episcopus of the Prussian National Church to the "Professors' Resolutions" recently passed by several synods. F. B.

From the Roman Church in Europe. The Pope has issued the following "Motuproprio" against Protestantism in Rome: "Two years ago We addressed a letter to Our Cardinal Vicar in Rome, in which We deplored the fact that the representatives of heresy were being given unbridled freedom in the capital itself. For this city, which stands at the head of the Catholic name, was destined by Divine Providence, and chosen above all others, that from it the light of evangelical truth might be spread over the whole world, as has been done with complete freedom for so many centuries. The sublime and absolutely divine authority (plane divinum officium) of the Roman See speaks out in no uncertain terms how unjust it is, and how much damage it causes, that temples and schools are being opened here by the spreaders of heresies, who are spreading evil and hostile doctrines among Our people. In order to counteract these new encroachments, as much as is in Us, We have confirmed with great satisfaction the recently launched enterprise 'of the Preservation of the Faith,' which has come into being at Our arrangement and instruction. But the dangers and damages are growing daily in a deplorable manner. Therefore, impelled by the love of apostolic care, We have decided to support the aforesaid praiseworthy enterprise by a firmer direction, and place at its head a special college of cardinals. By means of this, the municipal ecclesiastical authorities, in whose knowledgeable efficacy We place the greatest confidence in this matter, will be given significant help to fulfill the priestly duties abundantly and with full success. In this way also those outstanding men will find the courage for greater achievements who have hitherto worked with great praise for the spread of the Work. We therefore, by this Motuproprio, appoint a Council or Commission to direct and promote the work of preserving the faith.... Given at Rome at St. Peter's, this 25th day of November, 1902, in the 25th year of Our Pontifical Reign. Leo P. P. XIII" - It is especially the Waldensians and Methodists who cause the Pope much annoyance. They have rented a house opposite the Vatican with other Protestants, which offers a refuge to priests who have left the church. Towards the end of last year there were seven young priests in it. No wonder the intolerant prelates are baring their teeth, since they cannot look out of the Vatican without Protestantism coming under their eyes. - Against the equalization of Catholicism and Protestantism in Italy the "Osservatore Romano" has thus let itself be heard: "The Catholic Church, the one and only holder of the truth, can never, in the full consciousness of itself, admit that it will ever be equalized with any society of Protestants that has crossed the Alps to us. The Catholic Church can tolerate the other cults, and did tolerate them (?) when it still possessed a civil jurisdiction; but this only within the limits set by the law of reasonableness and equity, and without depriving the dominant religion of that preponderance which legally and factually belongs to it." From

of the "Voce della Verita" the work of the Protestants in Rome is called the "sacco di Roma", the plundering of Rome and the desecration of the Roman faith, reminiscent of the first Protestant invasion in 1527 under Frundsberg. - On November 28, the usual mass promotions took place in Rome at the Collegium Urbanum and the Gregorian Theological College. In one acte 159 doctorates were appointed, and 498 candidates were graduated to the preliminary stages of the doctorate, the licentiate and baccalaureate. The Jesuits, Dominicans and apostolic school brothers are said to have been no less liberal in their theological institutes. Although the "Doctor" has also become quite cheap in Germany, the wish of the "A. E. L. K." is justified: the government should see to it that the German scientific honorary degrees are to be distinguished from the foreign ones. - A Frenchman has published an article under the title: "To Rent the Purgatory," in which he proves statistically that Purgatory must have been empty for many centuries by virtue of the indulgences granted by the Pope. The article says: "And now do the math! There are about 150 million Catholics in the world; according to statistics, 10, 125 of them die every day. More than three quarters of this sum go to Purgatory. Yes, to avoid error, let us rather suppose that they all go to Purgatory. If we now suppose that half of them remain in purgatory, that is, 5062, we certainly still have a large number. Now a single believer who gains the slight indulgence of Pius IX ten times a day saves 5350 souls, that is, 288 more than Purgatory actually receives, and thus a single person can empty Purgatory every evening before he falls asleep. If one plenary indulgence is obtained from each million living Catholics in 24 hours, the 150 millions save 150,000 souls daily, and if only one plenary indulgence is obtained from each 10 million Catholics, 15,000 souls are saved in one day, that is, three times as many as enter Purgatory at all. But the figures given so far do not yet give any idea of the fabulous number of souls redeemed from the Purgatory, if the same were to be gathered there. Here is an example! On April 16, 1856, Pius IX granted all the indulgences of the Holy Land, of the seven basilicas of Rome, of the Portiuncula, and of St. James of Compostela to every bearer of a certain blue scapular, as soon as he prays six Our Fathers, Hail Marys, and Glories, without having to go to confession or Holy Communion. The indulgences involved here are significant; for Alphonsus Maria Liguori says in fine work: The Glories of Mary, Vol. II, Cap. 6, that the plenary indulgences amount to 533, while the plenary indulgences are innumerable. If, therefore, ten pious people repeat the said Exercitium ten times in twenty-four hours, they save 53,000 souls daily, that is, 43, 175 more than Catholics die at all in that day." - The Catholic hierarchy in Germany at present numbers 5 archbishops and 40 bishops. In Saxony, where Prince Augustus became pope in 1697 in order to obtain the Polish royal crown, Catholic immigration has increased considerably, especially since 1815. Among a population of 2½ million, there were already 53,000 Catholics in 1870. At present there are 181,251 Catholics among a population of 4^ million. Since 1895 the number has increased by 40,000. In the German Empire the Catholics have increased by 15 per cent and the Protestants by 13½ per cent. The Catholics in Bavaria, Alsace, Oldenburg, and Baden have proportionately decreased. Since 1890, 345,444 persons have entered the German Empire, the majority of whom were Catholics. The Protestants, on the other hand, have everywhere a considerably larger number of converts than the Catholics. - To

of the Kaiser Wilhelms University in Strasbourg, a Catholic theological faculty is now to be established. In the agreement between the government and the Vatican, Articles 3 and 5 thus read: "3. The appointment of professors is made after prior agreement with the bishop. The professors, before entering upon their function, are to place the professio fidei, according to the forms and rules of the Church, in the hands of the dean. (5) If the ecclesiastical authorities prove that a professor is to be regarded as incapable of continuing to exercise his teaching office because of his lack of orthodoxy or because of gross violations of the requirements of priestly conduct, the Government shall see to it that he is replaced as soon as possible and shall take the necessary measures to ensure that he ceases to be involved in the business of the Faculty. In Bonn, Breslau, and Münster, the government appoints; but the appointment must be omitted if the bishop raises justifiable objections. In Strasburg the bishop must give his positive consent before the government can appoint. In the Protestant Church, on the other hand, there is no ecclesiastical authority which can object, conditionally or unconditionally, to the appointment of a professor. Where is the much-vaunted parity? - Robert Großmann, who died last year, was fought by the papists with lies and slander because of the book he published on the moral theology of Liguori, which went through more than a hundred editions. The Stettin newspapers now report: "In all the lawsuits which our deceased chief was able to conduct even against individual ultramontane papers because of this, he remained victorious; no stain remained on him." - It is reported of the priest Prince Max of Saxony that on the day of his first mass he renounced the succession to the throne until the case of the total extinction of the family. It goes without saying that if this case should occur, Prince Max will also dispense with the celibacy in order to keep Saxony from the Albertines in the House of Wettin in the future. - One of the 150 rebellious priests of whom we reported in the November number of "Lehre und Wehre" has published an article in the "Contemporary Review" under the title "Voces Catholicae. In this article it is again asserted that a tremendous upheaval is in the offing in England against Ultramontanism. The Catholic Church is an enemy of science and fosters superstition, which has taken the place of religion. It is still taught that the devil, in the form of men or animals, seduces women, concludes a contract with Catholics written in blood, and takes possession of their bodies; but that he has a mortal fear of scapulars, rosaries, holy water, medals, and similar things of magical power. Priests who live in concubinage, blaspheme, steal, falsify wills, etc., are tolerated. But woe to the priest who opposes Roman superstition. If someone raises his voice against the church, he will be bitterly persecuted from all sides with lies and shameful slander. Those who were dissatisfied had only the choice between a life of hypocrisy or persecution, which repulsed even the most courageous. These reformers in the papacy also lack a double: the right diagnosis and the right remedy. They see all kinds of bitter symptoms in the papacy, but they do not recognize the "basic damage," the righteousness of the work. And they expect to be cured by enlightenment and science, when only the Scriptures, with their doctrine of the justification of a poor sinner by faith alone, are able to help. F. B.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 49. **March 1903.** **Na. 3.**

Religion in the state schools.

Not the only, but the most beautiful jewel in the crown of American liberty is the complete separation of church and state, and the liberty and equality of all religions and denominations which it implies. Before the law in the United States all citizens are perfectly equal, whether they be religious or irreligious, believers or unbelievers, Jewish, Gentile or Christian, Papist or Protestant, Calvinist, Arminian or Lutheran. The fact that a man is a Christian, or even a Protestant Christian, confers no advantage or privilege on him in the eyes of our State. And the fact that many millions of citizens in America are Jews, Masons, Unitarians, Theosophists, Mohammedans, Scientists, Atheists, Agnostics, or otherwise despisers of the Church and Christianity, does not disparage them in the eyes of the State, deprive them of any right, or exclude them from any office. In the eyes of American law there are neither believers nor unbelievers, neither Christians nor pagans, neither Catholics nor Protestants, but simply citizens and non-citizens. In England even the king must take a religious test oath, and in the period of the American state churches the same was true of the officials in America. Now our authorities do not put the question to any citizen or official: Are you a Christian or not? Do you believe that God is triune? Do you believe Christ to be God or a mere man? Do you profess the doctrine of inspiration? Art thou a Catholic or a Protestant? And if any man should ask an officer of the State to know to what denomination he belongs, in order to gain an advantage thereby, the officer must, in the spirit of American liberty and equality, answer him, "The State cares not for your faith or unbelief, and before the law neither your Protestantism is an advantage to you, nor your Catholicism a disadvantage." The American State does not merely tolerate every religion and confession, every church and fellowship, every cultus and

The American state does not at all give in to the question of which of the different religions is the true one, and it does not throw its weight into the dice of either religious truth or religious falsehood. The American State does not concern itself at all with the question of which of the various religions is the true one, and it throws its weight neither into the wager of religious truth nor into that of religious falsehood. The State does nothing to spread Christianity and nothing to restrict paganism. It favors no religion and puts a damper on none. As long as one does not disturb civil peace and order, the purpose of the State, he may believe and teach what he pleases. In short, the American state cares not for spiritual things, as the church as such should not care for political things. If the president of the country, or the governor of a state, or the mayor of a city, or any other official, is a Christian, the state does not prevent him from freely professing his personal faith before all the world. But he may not abuse his office to make propaganda for a particular religion, be it Christianity, Judaism, or lodge, and to give advantages to his fellow believers, but to put obstacles in the way of the representatives of opposing religious views. Dr. Lieber says: "It belongs to American liberty to separate entirely from the political government the institution (church) which has for its object the support and diffusion of religion." ("Civil Liberty," I, p. 118.) Cooley: "Nothing is more fully set forth or more plainly expressed (in the American Constitution) than the determination of its authors to preserve and perpetuate religious liberty, and to guard against the slightest approach toward the establishment of any inequality in the civil and political rights of citizens, which shall have for its basis only their difference of religious belief." ("Constitutional Limitations," p. 371.)

But if the American State does not wish to favor any religion or denomination and prefer it to others, it must not concern itself with religion at all. It may not (what is generally conceded) take any of the existing religions and elevate them to the status of state religion. Much less is he permitted (which is little recognized) to fabricate out of the existing religions a new general religion common to all denominations (non-sectarianism, undenominationalism), to designate this as the essential in all the religions of America, and to cultivate and spread it as the American religion. Precisely this has often been called the only right thing for our State and the only thing permitted by our Constitution. A religion common to all, which teaches only those things which all denominations represent, could be introduced by the State without making concurrence with the churches and preferring any of the existing denominations to the others. But quite apart

that "undenominationalism" has long since been advocated as a principle by several American communities (e.g. Disciples and Christians), and that these sects would thus be favored by the State, while all those who conscientiously protest against such a religion (non-sectarianism) would be raped, this plan is already impracticable because a general religion common to all Christian denominations (let alone to all religions) does not and cannot exist. A general religion derived from all existing religions does not even exist in thought. Therefore, the American state cannot make it a reality. If at all a thought is connected with the phrase "a general religion common to all denominations," it is always a certain religion, as a rule the heathen religion of blessedness through one's own piety. The Christian and Pagan, the Lutheran and Papist religions cancel each other out. Their answers at once to the first main religious question, How will the sinner be blessed? stand opposite to each other like yes and no. When all that has been removed by which the denominations bearing the name "Christian" differ from one another, there is nothing left of the specifically Christian. If, therefore, the American State wishes to practice religion, it must decide in favor of a certain religion, and eo ipso prefer this to all others. Without making a wicked distinction and abrogating religious liberty and equality, the State cannot concern itself with religion at all. It must leave the religious functions to the church, if it does not wish to act unjustly and unequally against its citizens. And even if there were a general religion common to all denominations, and even if no one in the country protested against this common religion, the American State could not give itself up to the care of it, because this would in fact create a state religion contrary to the constitution of the country. America, as a state, does not want to and must not have anything to do with cult and religion.

But if the American State does not want to practice any religion and does not prefer any religion over another, it may not introduce religious instruction in the State schools. If the State teaches and cultivates in its schools, for example, the Protestant or Catholic religion, then this is the foster child of the State and in fact the State religion: namely, the religion which the State teaches and professes. It has the advantage over all other religions that the authority of the State stands behind it, and that it is propagated with State money and by State officials and employees. And all citizens who do not agree with this religion, which is cultivated by the State in its schools, are compelled to support something which they conscientiously condemn and oppose, nay, are compelled to help to undermine and tear down their own religion with their votes and money. Where is the religious liberty and equality of the American citizen?

If the American state does not want to concern itself with things that do not concern it and that it does not understand as such; if it does not want to blur the line between state and church; if it does not want to establish a state religion; if it wants to maintain religious freedom and equality in the country; if it does not want to rape the conscience of its citizens and do them grave injustice; if he does not want to direct his power unnaturally against the people from whom he has received it; if he does not want to force his best citizens to disobedience and thus himself frustrate the purpose of his existence (peace and order); indeed, if he does not want to be an obstacle to Christianity and the church, he must keep his hands off religion and especially completely renounce religious instruction in his schools. Religious instruction in the state schools would not be a step forward, as many now think, but the first and indeed a tremendous step backward toward the state religion, indeed, in fact, itself only a form of it. And if our State has the right and the duty to establish religion in the country and, in the end, to introduce religious instruction in the schools, there is no reason why it should not erect churches and employ preachers wherever this appears to serve its purposes. Full religious liberty and equality exist only where the State does not concern itself at all with religion and religious instruction, and confines itself to protecting each individual citizen in his rights.

The Constitution of the United States contains two short sentences which determine the relationship between church and state. The first sentence reads: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." (VI, 3.) And the second: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." (First Amendment.) In other words, 1. no right shall be denied by the State to any citizen on religious grounds; 2. the State shall not interfere with religion or religious instruction; 3. the State shall not interfere with any person in the free exercise of his religion. - This is language that leaves nothing to be desired in terms of clarity. That the Federal Constitution forbids the State to perform ecclesiastical functions, among which religious instruction is chiefly included, is also admitted by Cobb, when in "The Rise of Religious Liberty in America" he thus writes: "In distinction from all the degrees of union and mutual dependence between Church and State, which have ever been obtained in the past or now exist in various parts of the Christian world, the American principle asserts an entire independence and separation, both as the Church might seek to control the organic action of the state, and as the state might affect to interfere with the faith or function of the Church. In their mutual relation, the Church is limited to the cultivation in the citizen of those virtues of order, truth, and right.

eousness, which shall mould good citizenship, and through that a righteous nation; while the state is confined to adjudication of such questions as involve the rights of property and of ecclesiastical corporations voluntarily formed under the statute law. The implied duty herein of the Church arises from the moral quality of its mission as a teacher of righteousness; while the duty of the state comes, not from religious considerations, but from its place as guardian of the good order of society."[1]) (p. 12.)

Of the religious position of the individual states, which are not bound by the Federal Constitution in this matter, 2) we likewise divide

1) Cobb summarizes the main points of American religious liberty: "It is well to bear in mind the several points of distinction which make up the American idea of religious liberty. Its complete separation of state from Church involves that: 1. The civil power has no authority in, or over, the individual or the Church, touching matters of faith, worship, order, discipline, or polity. 2. The Church has no power in the state to direct its policy or action, otherwise than its influence may be felt in the persuasion of the public mind towards the principles it teaches. 3. the state cannot appropriate public moneys to the Church, or for the propagation of religion, or any particular form of religion. 4. The Church cannot look to the state for any support of its worship or institutions, otherwise than, like all other corporations, it may appeal, and must submit, to legislation and judicial decisions in matters of pecuniary trusts and foundations, the ground of which legislation and decisions is not at all religious, but strictly civil. 5. The civil power cannot exercise any preference among the various churches or sects, but must hold all as having equal rights under the law, and as equally entitled to whatever protection under the law circumstances may furnish need for. 6. the civil power may not make any distinction among citizens on account of religion, unless the following thereof is dangerous to society. Neither the right to vote nor to hold office is to be invalidated because of opinions on the matter of religion. Nor, again, is a citizen's right to bear witness, or to inherit property to be called in question for reasons of religion. - Thus the severance of state from church - of civil power from all efficient concernment for religion - is made thorough to the minutest detail. As Story somewhat boldly phrases it, 'The Catholic and the Protestant, the Calvinist and the Arminian, the Jew and the Infidel may sit down at the common table of the National Councils without any inquisition into their faith and mode of worship. ' " (pp. 15. 16.)

2) Cobb writes: "The circumstances and constituents of the national government necessitated limitations of its law of liberty. Its provisions applied only in the federal sphere and had no force of law against a religious establishment in any of the states. The constitution conferred on the general government the right and duty to maintain in every state a republican form of government, but it bestowed no right of interference with the institutions of a religious character which any state might choose to establish, so long as the moral safety and the integrity of the nation were not involved. If, for example, one of the states should set aside its present form

from Cobb with the following résumé: "A comparison of their (State constitutions) provisions on certain lines will fully meet the need of the question here. As one illustration of similarity it may be noted that thirty-one constitutions use in their preambles the phrase 'grateful to Almighty God.' Three of them, Virginia, Louisiana, and Texas, substitute for this the words 'invoking the favor and guidance - or the blessing - of Almighty God.' All the constitutions have the name of God in some place, either the preamble or the section on religious worship, with the exception of Michigan and West Virginia. The constitutions of these two states have neither preamble, nor mention of God anywhere in the instrument, but the freedom of conscience and worship is emphatically decreed. No constitution contains the name of Christ. It will be noted that neither God nor Christ is named in the Constitution of the United States.-In regard to the expression of liberty all the states are at one in decreeing its full exercise, but there are interesting differences and similarities of statement. Twenty-six states declare that it is the privilege of 'every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.' Eleven say that 'the free enjoyment of religious sentiments and forms of worship shall ever be held sacred.' Five assert a 'duty of the legislature to pass laws for the protection' of religious freedom. Nineteen declare that 'no human authority ought to control, or interfere with, the rights of conscience.' Nine ordain that 'no person may be molested in person or estate on account of religion.' - In qualification of this liberty, thirteen states define that it is 'not to excuse licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety' of society; seven say that it is 'not to excuse disturbance of the public peace; ' three, that it is 'not to justify practices inconsistent with the rights of others; ' and three

of government and set up a monarchy, the national government under the constitution would be required to prevent such action. But if one of the states, even to-day, should change its own constitution and set up a State-Church, with the peculiar perquisites and power of an establishment, and should put such Church upon the public treasury for support, the general government has no power to prevent it For this reason, the adoption of the federal constitution did not abolish the various restrictions and establishments which obtained in different states. Each state was free to do as it willed in regard to Church, individual liberty of worship, establishment, religious taxation, and religious tests. They carried over into their future statehood the special institutions obtaining in 1789, and used their own time and method of making what changes they desired. For this cause, though full freedom was the law of the nation, yet in some parts of the union illiberal and oppressive restrictions obtained for many years, attended by more or less of struggle, until the last vestige of old distinctions was swept away: if, indeed, it can be said that they are all gone, even yet." (1. e. 510 f.)

With respect to the relation of individuals to the Church and of the Church to the civil law, twenty-four states forbid compulsory attendance or support of any Church; one (New Hampshire) says that 'no person of one sect may be compelled to support a minister of another;' and one (New Jersey) forbids compulsion of any person to attend worship 'contrary to his own faith. Five states forbid 'an established Church;' twenty-nine forbid the civil government to show any 'preference' for any one sect, and three, any 'subordination' of one sect to another. Two states, Delaware and Vermont, have it in their constitutions that 'every sect ought to observe the Lord's day and keep up some sort of religious worship.'-In the matter of support fourteen states forbid the appropriation of money from the state treasury for the support of sectarian institutions. Seven include municipal treasuries in the prohibition. Six apply the prohibition to any property of the state; and four, to any property of any municipality. Two states, Michigan and Oregon, carry this principle so far as to forbid the appropriation of public money to pay for the services of chaplains to the legislature.-In one thing a sharp contrast is notable. New Hampshire says that the legislature may authorize towns and parishes to provide for the support of religious teachers; Massachusetts and Missouri confine this authorization to parishes; the Maine constitution gives this power to 'religious societies,' without the intervention of the legislature; while Virginia and West Virginia forbid the legislature to take any such action. Religious tests are generally forbidden. Twenty-seven states declare that no religious test shall be required for office; eighteen add to this 'for any public trust.' Four states include voting as exempt from tests. Six forbid religious test for jury duty, and seventeen for witnesses, while two (Oregon and Wyoming) forbid the questioning of a witness in court as to his religious belief. Eleven states declare that no man can 'be deprived of any civil right on account of religious sentiments.'-Finally, there are to be observed a few exceptions and limitations. In five states, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and the two Carolinas, no person can hold office 'who denies the being of Almighty God or the existence of a Supreme Being.' Arkansas also makes such a denier of God incompetent as a witness. Pennsylvania and Tennessee restrict office to such as 'believe in God and a future state of reward and punishment. ' Maryland requires this belief in a juror or witness, but for the office-holder demands only a belief in God. Of these eight states thus requiring some religious qualification, Mississippi and Tennessee, by a curious inconsistency, forbid all religious tests as qualifications for office. -Mary-

land is the only state in the union which still requires the sanction of the Church, or a religious service, to create the status of marriage. The points on which all the state constitutions are at one are as follows : 1. No legislature can pass a law establishing religion, or a Church. To effect such purpose a change in the constitution would be required. 2. no person can be compelled by law to attend any form of religious service; or, - 3. to contribute to the support of any such service or Church. 4. no restraint can be put by law on the free exercise of religion; or,-5. on the free expression and promulgation of religious belief. Provided always, that this liberty 'shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or to justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State.'" (pp. 518-520.) Except, then, for some fossils which recall the Puritan period, and the severe struggles which it cost to throw off the state-church principle, and to give victory to religious liberty and equality, all the State Constitutions agree that the State shall not interfere with religion, shall not favor any religion or denomination, and shall not prevent any man from the free exercise of his religion.

Although the doctrine of the difference between the spiritual and the secular, between church and state, is as old as Christianity, the practical separation of church and state, which results in the freedom and equality of all religions and denominations, has rightly been called something specifically American and the most important element in Americanism. It is the realization of the idea of religious freedom and equality that distinguishes the new world from the old. To be sure, not all countries in the old world take the same position on religious liberty. Europe stands higher than Asia. And in Europe religious liberty is much greater in Protestant countries than in Russia and the Catholic countries. But full religious liberty and equality are excluded even in Germany and England, principally because there state and church are mixed, the state is occupied with religion, the state religion is preferred to all others, and thus religious equality is abolished. The European principle of the coupling of church and state excludes full religious freedom and equality. America has become the land of full religious liberty and equality. America differs from the old world not merely by a greater degree of religious tolerance, but principally. America has dropped the principle of the old world, the connection of church and state. Admittedly, in its colonial period America also tried the European principle, mixed state and church, and persecuted those of other faiths. Towards the end of the 18th century, however, America, after bitter experience, abandoned the European principle.

The Puritan period has seen the rejection of the Puritan principle, the separation of church and state, the removal of religion from the hands of the state, and the triumph of complete religious liberty and equality of all religions and denominations. And in spite of severe and protracted struggles, nothing has remained in the individual states from the mingling of church and state in the Puritan period but a number of inconsequences, anomalies and fossils in some state constitutions, a number of scars and naevi, which do not point to what is to become in America in the future, but to what has been and by right belongs to the past. Individuals to whom this piece of Americanism was held in mind as an ideal have also existed in Europe, and among these Luther stands high, who separated state and church a full hundred years before Roger Williams and also much more cleanly and sharply than the latter. But in no country of the old world did religious liberty and equality attain to dominion. Religious liberty, it was thought in Europe, meant the ruin of both church and state. America has taught the world the great truth that the State can exist and flourish quite well if it does not interfere with religion and the Church, and that the Church, too, develops most beautifully if the State leaves it unmolested, neither favors nor harasses it. In America, for example, the Lutheran Church has been able to develop in practice and constitution according to its innermost principles, as was not the case even in Luther's time (as he himself complains). That state and church serve their purpose best when they are not mixed with each other is a truth that America has not merely proclaimed as a doctrine, but has exemplified to the world for more than a hundred years. The more consistently the separation of church and state is carried out, the more surely and easily the state achieves the purpose of its existence, - this is the doctrine which has proceeded from America. And by this very teaching America has exerted a tremendous influence on all sides. The separation of church and state in Canada (Manitoba), Australia, and other countries, and the decrease of religious intolerance and the increase of religious freedom everywhere in the world, are in large part the fruits and effects of the American spirit. Of American religious liberty Bryce says: "Of all the differences between the Old World and the New this is perhaps the most salient." ("American Commonwealth," II, p. 554.) And Cobb writes: "It was reserved for the people and governments of this last settled among the lands to announce the religious equality of all men and all creeds before the law, without preference and without distinction or disqualification." . . . This pure religious liberty may be justly rated as the great gift of America to civilization and the world." (p. 2.) In proportion as the old world has given place to religious liberty, it has been Americanized. And he who dwells in this country, and himself enjoys the religious liberty of it, from

But whoever does not want to know anything about the separation between state and church with their religious equality, but rather fights it with all kinds of sophisms, is not only a bad Christian and Lutheran, but also lacks the main piece of the differentia specifica between a true American and a representative of the old world with its principle of the coupling of state and church. He has remained untouched by the leaven of Americanism, though he speaks an idiomatic English and traces his pedigree to the Puritans of Plymouth. Puritan blood and Boston English is no substitute for truly American sentiment, with which nothing is less compatible than religious intolerance in the State. To the extent that anyone mixes state and church and restricts religious liberty, he ceases to be a good and consequential American fine. 1) F. B.

(To be continued.)

A study of the death of our Lord on the cross.

(Continued.)

IV.

The proclamation of Christ's death is the sharpest preaching of the law, but at the same time - and above all - the most consoling preaching of the gospel and a revelation of God's love for us; this preaching brings us salvation, life and blessedness by working in us justifying faith, filling us with consolation and hope, and stirring us to godliness.

The death of Christ is preached in the church; the Christian sermon is the sermon of the death of Christ on the cross. "We preach Christ crucified," 1 Cor. 1:23. This is the apostle's glory: "But let it be far from me to boast, but only of the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ," Gal. 6:14. This is his wisdom: "For I thought not that I knew any thing among you, but JEfum Christ crucified," 1 Cor. 2, 2. This was the content of his preaching from the beginning of his apostolate to the end: "But I remind you, brethren, of this

1) It may sound presumptuous at first sight when the citizens of the United States call themselves American κατ' *εξοχήν, the Americans.*

But this is justified above all by the fact that in almost all the other states of North and South America the spirit of religious intolerance still prevails, and the European principle of the mixture of church and state rightly exists.

The gospel which I preached unto you... ... For I have given you first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures," 1 Cor. 15:1, 3.

In conclusion, let us consider the fruit and effect of this sermon on the death of our Lord on the cross. Luther has often referred to the pieces given above in the thesis, e.g. in the Sermon on the Contemplation of the Holy Passion of Christ (XI, 574), in the Sermon on the Benefits of the Passion of Christ (XIII, 330), and elsewhere, as effects of the Sermon on the Death of Christ.

The Concordia formula in the fifth article points out that the preaching of the death of Christ on the cross is the most severe preaching of the law, but at the same time - and above all - the most consoling preaching of the gospel. If the death of Christ is regarded as a mirror of sin, and preached for the purpose of showing what a dreadful thing sin is, then one has preached law. 1) "Accordingly, although the preaching of the passion and death of Christ, the Son of God, is an earnest and terrible preaching and display of God's wrath, by which people are only rightly led into the law after the covering of Moses has been done away from them, that they may only rightly realize how great things God requires of us in the law, none of which we can keep, and therefore should seek all our righteousness in Christ. but as long as all these things, namely, Christ's suffering and death, preach God's wrath, and terrify men, it is not yet the gospel's proper preaching, but Moses' and the law's preaching, and consequently a foreign work of Christ, by which he comes to his own office, which is to preach grace, to comfort, and to make alive, which is properly the preaching of the gospel." (Epitome, Müller, p.535.) Paralleling this passage, the Solida Declaratio adopts Luther's exposition of this subject in a sermon on the Gospel on the 5th Sunday after Trinity: "It is all the preaching of the law, which preaches of our sins and God's wrath, be it how or if it will. Again, the gospel is such a sermon, which shows and gives nothing but grace and forgiveness in Christ. Yes, what is a more serious, more terrible display and preaching of God's wrath against sin than the very suffering and death of Christ his Son? But as long as all this preaches God's wrath and terrifies man, it is not yet of the gospel, nor Christ's own preaching, but Moses and the law concerning the impenitent." (Müller, p. 635.) "By the law.

1) Then the gospel has not been turned into its opposite, but the preaching of the death of Christ from this point of view is not gospel, but rather law, and law in its strictest form.

The law is "a mirror that shows us the sinful nature hidden in our flesh". (Song 237, 3.) And such a clear mirror of the law is the preaching of the death of Christ. "This earnest mirror, Christ, will not lie nor reproach;') what it indicates must therefore be effusive." 2) (Luther, XI, 577.) We learn from the contemplation of Christ's death-suffering, "how fiercely our sins inflame the pious God, how vengeance and zeal go; how cruel his rods, how wrathful his floods, will I see from thy suffering." (Song 89:12.) "Deus patitur, Deus sanguinem fundit. Ex pretii magnitudine periculi aestima quantitatem; ex remedii pretio morbi aestima periculum. Magna omnino vulnera, quae nonnisi vulneribus vivificae et vivificantis carnis potuerunt sanari; magnus certe morbus, qui nonnisi morte Medici curari potuit." (Gerhard, "Med. Sacr." II.)

The sermon of the death of Christ is also a sermon of the law in that it announces condemnation to the unbelievers and the despisers of Christ. He who does not believe in Christ crucified will be condemned. It is written in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Cap. 10, 26-29: "For if we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, we have no more sacrifice for sins, but a dreadful expectation of judgment and of the fiery anger that shall devour the wicked. If any man break the law of Moses, he shall die without mercy, by two or three witnesses. How much more grievous punishment do you think he deserves who tramples under foot the Son of God, and impurely the blood of the testament by which he is sanctified, and reviles the Spirit of grace?" Unbelief, as Walther once says, "as it were itself brings down again the sins offered by Christ on the cross, and restores to those sins the condemnatory power which they had before." The Lamb of God bare the sin of the world, Joh. 1, 29. But from Revelation 6, 16. 17. we perceive that the unbelievers and despisers will be terrified at the very wrath of this Lamb in the day of judgment; in their fear they say to the mountains and rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb." Now when we testify this to unbelievers, we preach the law to them, and that in condemnatory severity; the preaching of the death of Christ is then, as our Confession says with Luther, "the law upon the impenitent." (l. c.)

1) For how men in anger exaggerate a thing, and in scolding and reproaching go beyond what is right, and increase the wrong, or as a bad mirror by a distorted image disfigures and insults us.

2) Only in hell itself, but then too late for repentance, will it again come so clearly into the eyes of men what sin, guilt and punishment of men are actually all about.

At the same time, the sermon of the death of Christ is the gospel, the most powerful and rich consolation for afflicted sinners; the content of this sermon is the fact that God is already reconciled with us; it is "the word of reconciliation," 2 Cor. 5:19. Thus this sermon is the most glorious revelation of God's love. "Wherefore God magnify his love toward us, that Christ died for us," Rom. 5:8. The preaching of Christ's death reveals an incomparable, unfathomable love, a "wonder love and power of love, which can do what never man thought." At this love the Son of God Himself marvels and exclaims, "Thus hath God loved the world." Of this love Luther says that he would confidently throw himself into its arms, even if it held a drawn, two-edged sword in its hand. For the sake of this love the apostle makes God and love one thing, and says, "God is love," 1 John 4:16. This is complete love, and he who has known this complete love can no longer be afraid of God Himself, nor therefore of death and judgment. Perfect love casts out all fear, and gives joyfulness to the day of judgment, v. 17. 18. "As sins have flowed out of Christ, and been known, so they must be poured upon him again, and the conscience made free." (Luther.) The preaching of the death of Christ brings us salvation, life, and blessedness, by working justifying faith in us. When I hear the word of the cross of Christ and take it to heart, the Holy Spirit thereby works enlightenment, that "I believe that JEsus Christ is my HErr," or as Luther expresses it in the Large Catechism, "I believe that JEsus Christ, truly the Son of God, has become my HErr." (Müller, p. 453.) As the Son of God, JEsus is, of course, our HErr and Creator from the beginning, but in the second article we confess that he is our HErr in virtue of his redemption; he became our HErr on the cross by purchasing us with his blood for his own. "Now what is this: 'to become a Lord'? It is that he hath redeemed me. ... Let this then be the sum of this article, that the little word HErr is most simply called a Redeemer." (Müller, p. 453 f.) But the word of the work of redemption creates faith in Christ, the Lord and Savior. Of the gospel which the apostle himself received, and then gave first to his hearers, and of which he reminds them again and again, he says, "Which also ye have received, in which also ye stand, by which also ye are saved, which form I preached unto you, if ye have kept it, unless ye have believed it in vain. 15:1, 2. He saith not, Ye shall be saved once; but by the acceptance of the gospel ye are saved now; ye have salvation in your hands, stand with God in grace, and are heirs now of eternal life; for if it should happen that ye should not keep, but lose again that which ye had, then ye would be in vain,

Otherwise it is impossible. Since God gave his Son to the world, and the Son sacrificed himself for sinners, and since the objective reconciliation of men to God is an accomplished fact, only faith, which appropriates this fact, is the way to the subjective reconciliation of the individual sinner. But it is this faith that the preaching of the atonement of the Son of God creates. Thus, even before His suffering, Christ Himself turned Nicodemus from a self-righteous Pharisee into a believing disciple of Jesus through the preaching of His imminent death on the cross, John 3:14-18; cf. 7:50-52, 19:39-42. And in the hour of the agony itself, the sacrifice of Christ produced such a blessed effect in many hearts; in the one malefactor, 1) in the Gentile chief, in many others who stood under the cross, it created faith, as in Joseph of Arimathea and in Nicodemus it strengthened the timid little faith and awakened confessional courage. "The sacrifice and prayer of Christ on the cross penetrates and bears fruit. The thief at the right hand is the first fruit of Christ's death; Joseph and Nicodemus are the other fruit. ... . Before they were secret disciples, ... Now they become public disciples and confessors." (Luther, XIII, 1825.) The preaching of Christ crucified continues to work to the end of days. Caiphas said, "It is better for us that one man should die for the people, than that the whole nation should perish," John 11:50. In this discourse the high priest "prophesied" without knowing it; "these things spake he not of himself, but because he was that year high priest," v. 51. God's Spirit spoke through this unworthy bearer of the sacred office; his words had a higher meaning than he himself could suspect. The Evangelist explains them by the remark, "For JEsus was to die for the people; and not for the people only, but that he might gather together the children of God which were scattered," βυναγάγ-^ εις = into one, or into a congregation
or, as it is said in chapter 10:16, that it should become "one flock and one shepherd. Through the preaching of the cross of Christ, men are converted to Christ, and those who are so converted are gathered together; thus the church is built up, the one, holy, Christian church, the congregation of the saints, whom Christ loved, and for whom he gave himself, that he might sanctify it, that it should not have spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, Eph. 5:25-27. To this fruit of his death the Lord pointed out to his disciples a few days before his passion, with the words John 12:23 f.: "The time is at hand.

1) Who was crucified at the right hand of Christ according to the church tradition. (Matth. 25, 33.) This man arrived at the place of judgment unrepentant; maybe he even joined in the mockery of the others at first, Matth. 27, 44. but the words of Jesus on the cross, the sight of the crucified, who himself was a living sermon, produced repentance, contrition, faith, prayer, love for the Lord and confession in the soul of this chessman.

that the Son of man may be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." That is: "I will be buried in the earth after my death as a noble, chosen grain of wheat, but afterward, when I have risen from the dead, ascended into heaven, and am exalted to the right hand of my Father, then shall much fruit be produced among the Gentiles through the preaching of the gospel of my suffering and death, and they will be converted in great multitudes to my kingdom, and will be gathered like good grains of wheat and brought into the heavenly barn, all of which is to be attributed to me, as the one pure and chosen grain of wheat, which will die and be made alive again." (Weim. Bible.) "If a Christian is asked by what means he has become a different man, he will always say, "The doctrine that God's Son suffered for all sinners, and also for me, has passed through my heart; it was this doctrine which became in me like a fire, which melted my hard heart, and inflamed my inmost being, my whole soul; and in this doctrine I live, as in my element."" (Walther, "Grace Year," p. 148.)

Bro. B.

(Conclusion follows.)

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Are vested choirs un-Lutheran? This is the question that is currently agitating the minds of General Synod and even more so of Conciliar, and about which much has been written, especially in The Lutheran. The "Lutheran" is careful to avoid the great doctrinal questions which move the American Lutheran Church. We do not recall that the "Lutheran" has even once dealt in detail with the question: Does man's conversion and blessedness depend solely on God's grace, or in part also on man's conduct? But if the interest turns on shirt-singers, deaconesses, etc., he is in his element. About five years ago "ekoirAorvvs" were denounced by the "Dulder Deaxue Revievv." Pastors were also soon found in the Concil and General Synod, who threw themselves into the harness with great zeal for vesleü odoirs with proeessioual and reeessioual dvinns. The "Lutheran Herald" wrote on February 28: "Unfortunately, even with us one begins to place the main emphasis on such secondary matters. Whether we thereby serve the Lutheran Church, we doubt very much. Sound doctrine and practice is, after all, the main thing." The "Church Gazette" of Reading is particularly annoyed at a notice in the "Lutheran" in which Father MacJntosh of Bethlehem, Pa. is hailed as the pioneer of "vesteü edoir inovemeut" in Pennsylvania. At Spring City, Pa. namely, MacJntosh introduced the first "Lutheran" shirt choir, and at Bethlehem he now has a choir of 32 boys in white overshirts. From an-

The case is thus reported in the March 14 issue: "A shirt choir was most solemnly installed by Rev. J. W. H. Heintz in Grace English Lutheran Church, Stroudsburg, Pa. The church was so crowded that the curious crowd stood outside the doors and windows as if at a theatre. This shirt choir is the first in the county. What an advance of Lutheranism!" How the "Kirchenblatt" evaluates this movement is evident from the following passages in the same number: "In the east of our country, one wants to know little of a Christian parochial school. In addition, there is a very inadequate confirmation class. There is no trace of catechesis. The future pastors learn a lot of liturgical formulas, but less of catechism. Hence the aping of the Episcopal Church with choir shirts, boys' choirs, processions, etc." (P. 86.) "In Dr. Krauth's day there was a serious struggle to be fought for the Confession. At that time one knew nothing of the Luther League, 'Individual' communion chalices, shirt choirs, etc. A new generation has arisen in the church, knowing little of Dr. Krauth and his work." (P. 84.) "The shirt singers in the Lutheran churches are defended in the 'Lutheran' by E. Augustus Miller of Philadelphia and Rev. J. C. Seegers of Easton, Pa. in a fire worthy of a better cause. It is sad what weight is laid in Lutheran congregations upon such frippery and aping of the Episcopal Church. Luther's catechism was unknown to the founder of these vested choirs at his ordination. Unfortunately, in many congregations that are Lutheran in name, Luther's catechism is not learned, and in Bible history the children are unknown!" (p. 70.) Several articles on this movement have appeared in the "Lutheran," in which the vested choirs have been partly rejected as un-Lutheran, and partly defended as adiaphora. Thus, for example, in the number of February 26, it says: "Are vested choirs and processionals un-Lutheran? Yes. Why? Because both are at variance not only with historic Lutheran practice, but also with Lutheran belief." So also a writer in the "Lutheran World," who at the same time refers to the judgment of several members of the Philadelphia Pastoral Conference of January 19, who called vested choirs "decidedly un-Lutheran. Against this judgment other preachers from the Conciliar have solemnly protested in the "Lutheran." They declare: Some years ago the matter had been brought up, and no one had objected to choir shirts. It is wrong, they say, to call an ecclesiastical usage un-Lutheran because it is not found in the Lutheran Church of Germany, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. Otherwise one would also have to reject the Sunday School. As long as no doctrine comes into consideration, one should not call the choir shirts something reprehensible in the Lutheran Church. - From both sides the line is crossed here. The fact alone that the history of the Lutheran Church knows nothing of vested choirs does not make them reprehensible and un-Lutheran. But it is even more wrong to claim that vested choirs as such contradict Lutheran doctrine. Where the organ stands in the church and where the choir sits and whether it is uniformed or not is adiaphoron, because nothing is commanded or forbidden about it in God's Word. But the opposing party, too, in his defense of vested choirs and professionals, omits a twofold point: 1. That it is sinful to give offence by reckless innovations, and 2. that in the present case we are dealing with a ceremony which is generally regarded as something specifically Episcopalian. In some Lutherans, therefore, these shirt choirs may awaken the thought, "There is little difference between Lutherans and Episcopalians," and in Episcopalians, "Our church must be the right one,

for even the Lutherans are approaching us." But if such an annoyance cannot be removed, the matter is decided for Lutherans. Of the ceremonies the Formula of Concord writes in the 10th article: "Accordingly we believe, teach, and confess that the church of God of every place and at every time shall have occasion in good faith, power, and authority to change, diminish, and increase the same without levity and vexation in a proper and due manner, as at all times shall be deemed most useful, conducive, and best for good order, Christian discipline and discipline, evangelical prosperity, and for the edification of the churches .

Conditions among Congregationalists. The "Congregationalist" points out the following deficiencies of his community: 1. the increase of preachers from other denominations, which endangers the traditions and faith of the Congregationalists ("A denomination which has not life in itself to furnish its own ablest leaders cannot grow"); 2. the low growth ("Congregationalism is marking time rather than moving forward"); and 3. the lack of unity in united missionary and loving activity. Especially the last point has been repeatedly emphasized by the "Congregationalist". More than a thousand congregations are without regular service. This could only be remedied by a closer union of preachers and congregations, which could be done without impairing the freedom of the local congregations. The "Advance" advocates unification even more energetically. He writes: "We ought to get together, and instead of Congregational churches have a Congregational Church, which should have power over ministers and churches to say, 'You stay here, or you go there.' " The basic evil in Congregationalism, however, is not lack of organization, but Socinianism. That man is a lost sinner who can only be saved by the blood of the Son of God is less often preached among Congregationalists than in any other evangelical community. This is largely due to the fact that the Congregationalists have accepted every spirit into their fellowship unseen. The Advance also points out this harm when it writes: "Once we have come to the point where we no longer believe that men are evildoers, or that Jesus can save them, or that they are in need of salvation, our mission as church or churches is over." About forty years ago a Congregationalist preacher in New England gave a lecture to the "General Association" of his fellowship on the "modern criticism" of the day, in which he also said, "The first of these critics was Satan in the Garden of Eden. He treated of the words which God spoke to Adam of the fruit of a certain tree: -Which day thou eatest thereof, shalt thou die the death? The critic contended: -by no means^ must be interpolated, so that the statement was: -You will die by no means of death? The amendment was adopted, and the world was lost. Brethren, beware of those people who know more philologically and exegetically than God knows. They are dangerous people, brethren!" Such dangerous people are now swarming among the Congregationalists. According to the judgment of a Congregationalist pastor in the "Independent," the pieces which ought to be deleted from the Apostolicum in order that it may be used with a good conscience in modern churches are as follows: 1. the title; 2. the conception of the Holy Ghost; 3. the birth of Mary the Virgin; 4. the ascension into hell; 5. the resurrection of Christ; 6. the ascension into heaven; 7. sitting at the right hand of God; 8. the return to judgment; 9. the resurrection of the flesh. Without reservatio mentaliss and reinterpretation, therefore, the Apostolicum cannot be used liturally in modern churches.

gical use any more. The confession of the Apostolicum presupposes a mood that is not compatible with the solemnity of this act. The only correct thing to do, therefore, is to remove the Apostolicum from the liturgy. - From his point of view the writer is right. If the Congregationalists no longer believe the Apostolicum, they should no longer confess it. But if they say A, they should also say B and delete from their liturgy and congregational titles the word "Christian." It is the height of dishonesty for a person to say that truthfulness does not permit him to confess the Apostolicum, and yet he lays claim to the Christian name.

F. B.

"The Chicago Sanhedrim." That's the title the "Presbyterian" the "Council of Seventy", which has chosen the elevation of religious education in the United States and Canada as its special task. The assembly of professors, editors, superintendents of state and Sunday schools, presidents of youth associations, pastors and educators, which the Council of Seventy called together from all parts of the country for the realization of its plans, met in Chicago from February 10 to 12 as the "Convention for Religious and Moral Education". Besides numerous visitors, 360 delegates were present. Among these were not only many representatives of higher criticism and liberal theology, but also Unitarians, inlldcis (e.g. the notorious Pearson) and others not belonging to any church fellowship. From the General Synod, as the "Lutheran World' reports, Rev. W. S. Sigmund of Columbus, Jnd. was present, and the meeting on Wednesday afternoon was opened and closed by him with prayer. There was no free discussion. The "Sanhedrim" had seen to it that only people could speak who did not disturb his circles. According to the program, the appointed speakers gave their lectures. The intention was obviously to conceal rather than reveal the theological tendency of this movement for the time being. Among others, the following topics were treated: "The next step in religious education." "The promotion of religious and moral education." "The Sunday school. "On the last-named subject, the Sunday school, with its incompetent teachers and puny services, was mercilessly pilloried. One speaker even stooped to the assertion, "Some Sunday schools are immoral." Only One resolution was passed, in which the meeting declared: (1) That progress in religious and moral education was necessary; (2) That for the promotion of higher ideals and better methods, an organization was necessary; (3) That this association would not advocate distinctive doctrines; (4) That it should not confine its work to the Sunday schools; (5) That it would not abolish, but influence, the existing institutions, and through them accomplish its purpose. The home, the school, the Sunday-school, and other existing institutions are to remain the organs through which the Chicago Convention intends to bring in the modern conception of religious education. It only wants to take over the religious leadership, as it were as "general staff", "clearing house", "bureau of information", "central source of life and power". - It is clear, especially from the speeches delivered in Chicago, that (apart from other things) the purpose of this connection is twofold: 1. to make propaganda for liberal theology, and 2. to make the state schools serviceable for this purpose. As to the second point first, the "Congregationalist" of February 28 writes: "In Chicago they have been persuaded that the time has come for general and systematic instruction in morals to be given in the public schools.

The first is to set up schools through which alone all children can be reached, and that this can be achieved if one proceeds wisely. "There were differences of opinion as to how much is possible; but there was evident an intention to test the opportunities which state laws allow to the furthest." "Shall we take" - said Pros. Coe - "let the citizens, who are morally lowest, dictate how much of morality the State may teach its children?" Dr. Horr: "The State gives moral laws; the State ought to teach its children how to keep its laws." David Beaton: "The system of so-called secular education was a great blunder because it left out the most important piece in life: morality and cultivation of character." Carr: "The fundamental truths of religion can be taught in the government schools without anyone being offended by them." Others spoke similarly. The Lutheran World writes: "The almost unanimous view of the convention was that the state may teach morals, and that the Bible is the best textbook for that purpose." - As to the first point, the very composition of the Chicago Convention shows that the religion which this society wishes to propagate is not the Christian, but the universal religion. In an official document it was declared that "all the scholarly and progressive workers in the field of religion and morality" were determined to make this association a religious power of the twentieth century. It was then emphasized by Harper and other speakers that science, not dogmatism, was the guiding star of this movement. It was reprehensible, he said, to instill in the youthful mind all sorts of doctrines of faith, and to bind it to certain creeds. The theory of inspiration must give place to facts. Criticism, which solves the problems of tradition, must be heard. At the time of the Reformation, one had referred to the Bible. But this was as wrong as it was convenient. The Bible is no authority over us. The theory of an infallible Bible with supernatural revelation has long since become obsolete. One Unitarian declared that the 66 books of the Bible should be rendered "in the terms of a noble interpretation". And what our Republic lacks is "a vitalized intelligence and rational enthusiasm." Another said: modern psychology and pedagogy must come into its own. Religion is a human disposition which must be developed naturally. "Bring out the moral powers of a child in normal order.... "Songs in which we describe ourselves as "poor sinners" should not be sung in Sunday schools. Nor should there be so much talk of the hereafter. "Make the most of the present life." He who strives, therefore, will not come short in that life. - Finally, as far as the evaluation of this movement by the ecclesiastical press is concerned, it was almost without exception a favorable one (in many cases probably out of ignorance of the facts). The "Watchman," "Christian Advocate," "Apologist," "Messenger," and other papers are full of praise. The "Congregationalist" writes of February 28: "In the course of the years we shall reach as a people, through the fatherly guidance of this new association, a knowledge of religion that shall hold the mind as well as the heart." At the Chicago meeting one speaker stooped to blasphemy: the Chicago convention had removed all doubt from his mind as to the inspiration of the modern spirit. It was of greater importance, he said, than that of the apostles on the day of Pentecost. We conclude with some sentences of the "Presbyterian", who from the beginning portrayed the described movement as an attempt of the liberal theologians to win new canals for their unbelief. He writes: "The movement is an academic propaganda, a device to corrupt the young with higher criticism."

"The whole affair is a set-up job on the Christian Church. It is a scheme in the interest of critical scholarship and of liberal thinking." "The sooner it comes to its demise, the better for evangelicalism." F. B.

Independent Catholic Church in the Philippines. From the Philippines several priests with their followers have broken away from Rome, taken possession of various churches and monasteries, and refused to allow the newly appointed priests to enter them. The leader of this movement is the priest Aglipay. The papal delegate, Archbishop Guidi, thereupon requested Governor Taft to expel the independent Catholics by force. This, however, the governor refused to do. He told the Archbishop that it was for the court to decide who was the rightful owner. Attorney General Arenta and Secretary of War Root agreed with him. On this the Catholic press of our country again raised a hue and cry about Protestant propaganda in the Philippines. In proof of this the Irish World also points to the appointment of several Protestant teachers in schools where all the children were Catholics, and to the introduction of a history of the United States written by a non-Catholic. - This is the thanks we get for our Government in Cuba and the Philippines for helping the Catholic Church to its feet. F. B.

From the Roman priests in the Philippines writes a correspondent of the "New York Sun": "These Padres are not disciples of Christ or ministers of the gospel. They are a mercantile society, and their connection is one of purely business purposes, which is why they have gone far and thoroughly understand it. In this they are masters. Their business is to extract money from the believers, and they do this by cultivating superstition and image worship.... . Any American priest who has the courage to be independent feels disgust at the way the great Catholic Church was run in these islands. These people did not stop at any crime they committed in the name of the church. They seduced the young and innocent, enforced it to kill those who resisted them, robbed the ignorant by making them tremble with the terrors of purgatory! Their only business was to collect money, not to spread religion. I have used pretty strong language," continues the correspondent, "but I give you my word of honour that I have not exaggerated in the least, and I will also say that I am not in the least prejudiced against these people. I have said nothing, for instance, about priests having families and bringing up children. This is of course a violation of their vow of celibacy, but they should never have promised to do so. They have generally been kind against their families and raise their children whom they are not allowed to acknowledge. The country is full of children who are proud of the fact that a 'friar' is their father."

II. foreign countries.

Attacks on Missouri in Germany. As reported by the Saxon "Freikirche" in various numbers, the accusation of Calvinism was made against Missouri last year by the "Lutherischer Gotteskasten," by the Alsatian "Theologischen Blättern," by the "Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt," by the "Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz," and by the "Evang.-Lutherisches Sonntagsblatt der Immanuel-Synode." The "Lutheran God's Box" claimed "that Missourians have fully embraced the Reformed doctrine of election by grace." The "Theologische Blätter" called the remarks in the "Gotteskasten" an "article that hits the mark" and printed it. The same ge-

This was done by the "Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Saxon Church and School Gazette), which years ago had first raised the accusation of Calvinism against Missouri and then retracted it. The "Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz" likewise asserted in its 20th number that the predestination doctrine of the Missourians "agrees almost word for word with the statutes of the Dortrechter Synod." And the "Sonntagsblatt" of the Immanuel Synod wrote on December 21: "But others, like the Missourians, speak of an election of grace, which comes precariously near to the Reformed doctrine... which simple, grace-hungry souls cannot understand, much less allow to be a comfort to them, and which presents itself as a useless philosophizing in the words of Scripture." In proof of his assertion, the "God's Box" cited the seventh article of the Dordrecht resolutions, and next to it he placed a definition of the election of grace, which he called the Missourian. When hereupon the Saxon "Free Church" 1'. Knappe, the editor of the "Gotteskasten," asked him to state where in Missourian writings the passage cited against Misfouri in his paper was to be found, the "Gotteskasten" wrote superiorly: "Mr. Pastor W. will find the citation verbatim in 'Lehre und Wehre,' 1873, 40; it passed into the 'Zeitschrift für Kirchliche Wissenschaft' in 1882 (issues 9 and 10)." At the same time, Father Knappe, who was not entirely comfortable with the matter, declared "that Calvin's teaching, as if God had destined those who perish to eternal damnation, cannot be laid to the charge of the Missourians." Father W. then informed Father Knappe by letter that the Missourians were not to be blamed for this. Knappe by letter that in "Lehre und Wehre," 1873, p. 40, the words in question were not to be found. In his great distress, Father Knappe now confessed that the article on Missouri Calvinism did not come from himself, but "from an otherwise well-informed co-worker," to whom he would write at once. "Had I" - it continues verbatim - "not received the article in question, which found your lively opposition, from this very man, I would have rejected it at once, as I did not think the evidence sufficiently ftringent. The difference between us and Missouri is in another field. I am otherwise a supporter of Iowa, but in regard to the election of grace controversy with Missouri, I find the appeal to the formula 'intuitu fidei' as unscriptural as the Missouri evidence of the rejection of that formula. Missouri would be in the right if it did not defend itself by Calvinistic: means." Then, about three weeks later, Father Squire made the epistolary announcement that the passage in question was taken from the "Church Journal" of the Iowa Synod, 1892, Issue 3. At the same time Fr. Knappe again remarked: "... although in my opinion the Missourians are in the right in rejecting the 'intuitu fidei', many of their other positive conclusions are, in the almost unanimous opinion of all non-Missourian Lutherans, Calvinistic". The cheap claim of D. W.'s demand that it be stated in the "God's Box" that the passage cited against Missouri was taken from opposing writings, remained unfulfilled. Again, however, Father Squire emphasized in a letter: "It is wrong, however, to accuse the Missourians of Calvinism. I am bitterly sorry that in No. 1 of the 'Luth. Gotteskasten' I let pass the passage in the article of my co-worker, as if the Missourians had completely accepted the Reformed election of grace." -With this, however, the "Gotteskasten" has only partially justified its slander. The other papers mentioned by us, however, lack even this partial sense of justice against Missouri. They stick to their slanders and are usually content with mere assertions. They proceed from the assumption, based on many years of experience, that the hatred against Missouri is fully sufficient ratio sufficiens for the willing acceptance of the assertion of Missouri's Calvinism.

will prove. The "Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz" also asserted in its 20th number that the predestination doctrine of the Missourians "agrees almost word for word with the statutes of the Synod of Dordrecht." When the editor's attention was called to the unprovable slander in his paper, an article followed in No. 22 with the same "citation from L. u. W." which the "Gotteskasten" had brought into the field against Missouri. After the "Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz" had demonstrated its error ad oculos, it issued the following characteristic statement: "Concerning Missouri's doctrine of predestination, I will gladly testify, at the request of Father Walter in Hanover, that in its negative part, concerning exclusion from salvation, it does not at all agree with the doctrine of the Calvinists. On the contrary, it stands in the sharpest opposition to it and rejects it as contrary to Scripture, ungodly, and devilish. Brother F. certainly did not want to deny this when he speaks of the almost literal agreement of the Missouri doctrine with the statutes of the Synod of Dordrecht in No. 20 of this journal. But he presumably finds this agreement in the statements about the election to blessedness and its justification, which is not conditioned by anything in man. And that he is not alone in this view, he proves in No. 22 by citing quite weighty testimonies. This, of course, does not prove the assertion to be true; it is merely an occasional expression of his view, in which many will agree with him, but others will not. Doctrine, after all, is far too difficult to be done so incidentally." -Here at least it is plainly stated why the Missourians are thought to be Calvinists, namely, because they teach by the Concordia formula, that it is false and unjust to teach that not only the mercy of God, and the most holy merit of Christ, but also in us, is a cause of God's election, for whose sake God has chosen us to eternal life. In their calumnies, however, Missouri's opponents not only fall into contradiction with Scripture and the Confession, but also fall prey to a clumsy sophism. They conclude thus: The Missourians' doctrine of election by grace is Calvinistic, because some aspects of their doctrine are found in the Reformed doctrine. From some moments they quickly conclude to all, from the similarity of common characteristics to specific identity. The moment of the Missouri doctrine of the election by grace, which Scripture and the Confession emphasize so strongly, namely, that there is no cause of election in man, is also found by the opponents in the Dordrecht resolutions, and thoughtlessly the cry of Missouri's Calvinism resounds from all sides. From the partial similarity of the earth to Mars, Tesla and other fools have drawn the conclusion that Mars is also similar to the earth in that there are men on it. This is exactly what the opponents of Missouri do. Before they have made it clear what the essence of Calvinism actually is, as distinguished from Lutheran doctrine, they brand Missouri as Calvinistic. And when they are asked what makes the doctrine of the Synodal Conference Calvinistic, they point to a feature which the Concordia formula describes precisely as a characteristic of the Lutheran doctrine of election. If, however, such an unworthy inference from some characteristics to all, and from the similarity of common parts to specific identity, it would be easy to prove to Missouri's opponents that they, too, teach in a reformed manner, not only in baptism and the Lord's Supper, but even in the doctrine of election by grace. Our opponents say, for example, with Calvin: God has chosen, not all, but some; from eternity; to blessedness, etc. According to the rules of

Therefore, if they were to apply the doctrine of the election of grace, which they use against Missouri, then Missouri's opponents would also be true Calvinists. In short, the enemies of the Missouri doctrine of election by grace show (quite apart from a gross ignorance of the sources) not only a lack of the right use of Scripture, but also of the right use of reason. It would save our opponents, both here and there, from many a sin against the eighth commandment, if, before they take up the tomahawk against Missouri, they would first make clear to themselves the terms with which they intend to operate. F. B.

Concerning the concept of the true visible church, we find the following statement in the Breslau "Kirchenblatt": "We know well that the church exists primarily in the fellowship of eternal goods in the heart, but in some way it must appear in this earthly world as a fellowship of faith, it must have some form, and we are not able to recognize it in this supposed Lutheran church, which is supposed to be within the Prussian regional church. We can recognize it in the Lutheran Church in Saxony, in Mecklenburg, etc., we can see it in the Lutheran Church in Prussia, there is the High Church College, there the General Synod meets every four years, etc. - small and small as that is, it can still be seen, there is still a form. But we cannot do that with the 'Lutherans' in the national church. We may see Lutheran associations there, as in Ravensberg, in Pomerania, etc., but we cannot see a Lutheran church. That is more, as someone once said, a conundrum, which one has to look for very hard." One feels quite sorry when one sees apparently well-meaning people indulging in such delusions. But that is what happens when one makes something other than pure Word and Sacrament the hallmark of the orthodox church. Thus it happens to the Breslauers that they ascribe to the regional churches of Saxony and Mecklenburg the character of Lutheran churches, although in the latter the more atrocious of the unions, namely, the doctrinal union, is just as much in bloom as within the ecclesiastical-regimental union of Prussia. "In some way" the Lutheran unions in Ravensberg and Pomerania are just as visible as the Breslau Oberkirchencollegium and the Saxon and Mecklenburg regional churches. But the "in any way" is not enough. Only the way in which the pure doctrine of the Word of God is unanimously known in a community is sufficient. Where this visibility and audibility is not present, one may have three colleges of the High Church and call oneself a "Lutheran Church" six times: there is still no visible Lutheran Church. Least of all, of course, does a spire. The article in the Breslau "Kirchenblatt" concludes thus: "In Reinswalde in Lower Lusatia there is also such a congregation" (which has not allowed itself to be put into the Prussian Union bag). "It has the external advantage of having the numerical preponderance in its village (more than three quarters of the population); it has allowed itself to be deprived of its external church property and in the 53 years of its existence has built a new church, parsonage and school buildings, has also been content for 53 years without a tower and has decided to celebrate its church festivities without ringing bells, but it is carried by the thought: We are a church, a member of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Prussia! And as a public confirmation of this, it is seriously considering adorning its beautiful large church with a corresponding steeple. For years she has already collected pennies for it. We get nothing from the state. In its eyes we are not supposed to be a church, we are supposed to be a sect in the corner. We have even been told by fellow church members in the village: "Let them

only build a tower, they are not allowed to ring/ That means nothing else than: We shall not be a church. If now also such speech is invalid, as expressly on an inquiry to the royal government of the same is pronounced, then it will the municipality nevertheless nobody blame, if it wants to confirm the truth: We are church - now also before all world thereby that it decorates its house of worship with a tower and loads the municipality with bell ringing to the service. That is why we now want to get serious about building our tower in Reinswalde. Now we know quite well that the words of St. Pauli apply to our church in a special way: Not many noble, not many mighty according to the flesh/ But we also know that some of such 'mighty' (that is, those who have some silver and gold at their disposal) have nevertheless found their way into the Lutheran church. Even if we do not want to claim the widow's mite, because we know that this may only be done for emergencies, we still think in our hearts: perhaps there is one or the other among these 'mighty ones' who, in a good hour, will give his heart a push and join in our battle cry with a certain deed: We, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Prussia, claim to be the Church." F. P.

"What do the Lutheran Associations in Prussia want?" This question was answered in the "E. K. Z." by the Central Board: The Lutheran associations had succeeded in the past in turning the intended absorptive union into a confederative one, in which "the right of the Lutheran church and the Lutheran confession was expressly guaranteed. They also had the "merit" of having thrown up a strong wall against the "disastrous separation". In the future, too, it would remain their task to make the Lutheran confession more and more fully developed in cult, congregational order, constitution, and government. In addition, the purpose of these associations was to participate vigorously in the work of external and internal missions, as well as to cooperate in the solution of the burning questions of the present (combating materialism, radical biblical criticism, Methodist emotional Christianity, false subjectivism, Roman propaganda, etc.). The Lutheran associations had a good organization which enabled them to realize their goals. What they could use, however, was more members. Their main principle was: We stand on the confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. - The Lutheran associations in the united state church think of the relationship between Lutheran and united roughly like the relationship between Prussian and German. Just as someone can be a good Prussian and at the same time a good German, so also a strict Lutheran and a good Unionist at the same time. But that Unionism contains within itself elements that are incompatible with Lutheranism, indeed, that Unionism is consequently nothing other than the abolition of Lutheranism, and that for this very reason one can no more be a good Lutheran and a Unionist at the same time than one can be a good German and a good Frenchman at the same time, is something that does not make sense to the Lutherans within the Prussian Union. Why? Because they would thereby condemn themselves. F. B.

Theology students at German universities. We take the following information from the "Weser-Zeitung": In the journal of the Royal Prussian Statistical Bureau (1902, 1st and 2nd quarterly issues) a valuable and noteworthy treatise has appeared on the frequency of German universities from 1830 to 1900 and the distribution of students among the individual faculties, edited by Dr. E. Petersilie. According to the lists in this treatise, no other faculty has had such a strong increase in the number of students within this seventy-year period.

The number of students of Protestant theology has fluctuated as much as the number of students of Protestant theology. Protestant theology was studied in Germany: in the semester 1830-31 4267, 1851-52 1614, 1860-61 2550, 1870-71 1827, 1876-77 1502, 1888 4793, 1893 3502, 1899-1900 2352, 1902 2281. In the semester 1830-31 Protestant theologians made up 26.9 percent of the total student body, in the semester 1885-86, however, only 16.4 percent and in 1899-1900 only 7.2 percent. In 1902 this number dropped to 6.2 percent. Theological studies had two peaks during the period mentioned, in 1830-31 and in 1888, with over 4000 theological students. A small swell at the beginning of the sixties does not signify an actual peak. In between are the lows of 1851-52 and 1876-77 with little more than 1500 theology students. At the moment we seem to be approaching a low point again. Since 1890 the number of students has been declining, and this decline has already reached a stage that must give cause for concern." - So far the "Weser-Zeitung". In view of the total depravity of theology at the German universities, it is not at all to be regretted that the number of students of theology is declining more and more. F. P.

Founding years of German universities. The "Voss. Ztg." writes: "On the occasion of the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the university in Breslau, it should be pointed out that the Leopoldina in Breslau, which was founded by Emperor Leopold I. and merged with the university in Frankfurt a. O., the Viadrina, in 1811, is one of the younger universities in Germany. Heidelberg is the oldest university; it was founded as early as 1386, and has thus existed for 516 years; it is followed by Leipzig, founded in 1409, Freiburg in 1454, Greifswald in 1456, and Tübingen in 1477. Five German universities are thus more than 400 years old. The university in Marburg was founded in 1527, Königsberg in 1544, Jena in 1558, Würzburg in 1582, Gießen in 1607, Kiel in 1665, Halle in 1694. Then comes Breslau, founded in 1702, followed by Göttingen in 1737, Erlangen in 1743, Berlin in 1810, Bonn in 1818, Munich in 1826, Strasbourg in 1872, and Münster, where the academy was converted into a university only last year. Even older than the German universities are those at Prague and Vienna, established in 1348 and 1365. The university at Basle was also founded as early as 1460. Quite numerous are the universities which have perished. At Cologne a university was established in 1388, only two years later than at Heidelberg, but it was closed in 1801, having at last passed entirely into the hands of the Jesuits. Still four years before the Heidelberg university, a university was established at Erfurt in 1382, which was closed in 1816. The University of Wittenberg existed from 1502 to 1815, and was then united with Halle. At Ingolstadt a university was founded in 1472, which, of course, was at last only a Jesuit college, and was transferred in 1800 to Landshut, whence it came to Munich in 1826. Frankfurt a. O. had a university from 1505 to 1811; in the latter year it was united with that of Breslau, as has been remarked. Helmstädt had a university from 1575 to 1805, which for a time enjoyed great renown. Duisburg had a university from 1656 to 1819. Of smaller universities, which enjoyed a shorter existence, may be mentioned Neustadt a. Hardt (1578-1583), Altdorf (1573-1819), and Rinteln (1610). " F. B.

Lord's Supper. We read in the "A. E. L. K.": "The multitudes of the Christians (in the time of the Passion) flow to the altars, in order to receive the full fruit of his suffering and death in the sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour, and to proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes. For as the season of the Passion is the sacred time of the ecclesiastical year, so the Holy Communion is the climax of the divine service.

life." That only in the Lord's Supper "the full fruit" of Christ's passion is received, and that in this sense the Lord'S Supper is "the climax of the life of worship," is not only a *ἄγραφον*, but also a *ἀντίγρηφον*. In every evangelical sermon, yea, in every evangelical saying, Christ gives the whole, full grace which he hath purchased for men (2 Cor. 5:18, 19.), and he that believeth the gospel hath received not merely half, but the whole fruit of Christ's suffering and death. The gospel gives the whole fruit, baptism gives the whole fruit, and the Lord's Supper also gives the whole fruit. God has chosen this multiple way of communicating grace because, as our confession puts it (Schmalk. Art., p. 319), he is "abundantly rich in grace. He would so gladly remove all doubt of grace from the hearts of men by the repeated impartation of the same grace. F. P.

The Subjectivity of Science. The German Emperor, in his letter to Admiral Hollmann, says of the Assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch: "It is with Delitzsch that the theologian has gone up and away with the historian, and the latter serves only as a foil for the former." So it is. Delitzsch, as a theologian, is unbelieving, and he now looks for supports for his unbelief in his excavations in Babylonia. But so it is with the "objectivity" of "science" in at least 99 cases out of 100. "Science" is not concerned with knowledge, but with the confirmation of the unbelief that is found in the mischievous "scientific" individual. That Delitzsch and the other "representatives of Assyrian science in Berlin" (as they call themselves) are rather empty-headed and, in addition, of little noble character, is evident from their mean public attack on Hilprecht. F. P.

Hollow phrases about science. At the exmatriculation of the German Crown Prince, the Rector of the University of Bonn said, among other things: The value of science for the individual had never been praised more beautifully and upliftingly than by Frederick the Great, who had written: "Science grants us the pleasures of the mind, which are more lasting than those of the body. It soothes the crudest morals. It spreads its charms over the whole course of life. It makes our existence sweet and takes away the terrors of death." - That "science" is not capable of this, Frederick the Great proved by his own example. As is well known, he wanted to spread "enlightenment" "in the provinces over which he had been made ruler by the accident of his birth. He made a sincere effort in this respect, but thereby did not make "existence" truly "lovely" for himself and others. The greatest prince of the century was exceedingly unhappy. In the face of death he said, "I am a worn-out old fellow-the devil will soon take me." Kahnis says of Frederick the Great: "Frederick said of his father that he died like a Christian. When Frederick died, no one of his family was allowed to dare come near him. His wife, to whose virtue he himself gave the strongest testimony in his will, never came to Sanssouci. The last care he expressed with consciousness concerned his dog..... He died in a chair, a prince to the last moment, but a prince without love, faith, hope." ("The Inner Course," etc. I, p. 293.) F. P.

About the bondage of science by self-interest and malice, the "Old Faith" writes: "Those attempts of an innovation-addicted direction in today's natural science, which would like to assign the rule to the hypothesis alone, are to be emphatically rejected in the barriers. Especially when we consider that

these 'hypotheses' are all too often put forward not in the service of science and truth, but to achieve petty, selfish ends. They tend to sink back into nothingness within a short time. But even during the short time of their existence they have had enough opportunity to cause quarrels, disorder, confusion, and shifts of opinion, and this not only in scientific circles. It is an indispensable duty of all representatives of true science to resolutely oppose all such attempts, which are only capable of exposing in the most shameful manner the noble goddess of truth (!), whose faithful disciples and zealous pupils they are supposed to be. It is rightly complained of in our time that in science so much fraud, so much falsehood, so much deceit is practised. Science is accused of selling itself for money to the highest bidder, like a fine whore, of openly and unabashedly using the otherwise so frowned upon 'probabilism' as a coin that can be used everywhere. Now, to a large extent, this corruption of science is due to the hypothesis addiction, this addiction of its unworthy representatives to 'make a career' as quickly as possible by establishing a doctrine that is captivating through its dazzling version, that serves base sentiments or special interests, that is therefore valued and protected, but that is basically untenable. Science is degraded to a servant where it should be the mistress. One does not court it for its own sake, but in order to be able to give free rein to one's passions and inclinations through its possession. In this way, therefore, no advancement is to be expected. Where this is to be found, how it is to be attained, we have shown. Here, too, as in so many fields of our modern cultural life, the watchword is not: 'Progress!' but: 'Conversion!'" - Incidentally, "science" as "mistress" and "noble goddess of truth" requires a remark. The "noble goddess" cannot stand on her own feet, as things are after the Fall. He who does not belong to Christ belongs to the devil. And whoever belongs to the devil, the devil takes him captive with all that he is and has. The devil also puts the "noble goddess of truth" into his sack, and makes her see all sorts of things in it, but little truth. F. P.

Dr. Weinel professes his support for Strauss. In the Casino at Solingen in the Rhine Province, the Privatdocent Lic. Dr. Weinel-Bonn gave a lecture on October 29, the first of a series of lectures on "Dav. Friedr. Strauß and the Critique of the Life of Jesus". The lecturer professed unreservedly views which were not far removed from those once held by Strauss. He denied the supernatural origin of JEsu, the historicity of His miracles, His resurrection on the third day, the significance of His death for salvation. One of the Protestant pastors took occasion to speak a serious word on the matter in the Reformation festival sermon on November 2. Lic. Weinel replicated in the "Solinger Zeitung" and challenged the pastor to "face him eye to eye". So on November 12, after Weinel had given his second lecture on "Renan," there was a regular disputation, in which Lic. Weinel experienced that the blades of Solingen are sharp. One can imagine that the Romans and the Social Democrats rubbed their hands in glee at these proceedings. Since Lic. Weinel holds a position of trust as Inspector of the "Evangelical Theological Foundation," one is anxious in the Rhineland to see whether the church regiment, or rather the theological faculty to which he is subordinate, will in any way take a stand on this wild agitation. (A. E. L. K.)

The Ritschlian, Prof. Bassermann, writes of **the Second Coming of** Christ in the "Monatsschrift für christliche Praxis" (Monthly Journal for Christian Practice), which he edits: "Who today finds

the courage to assert the idea of the Second Coming of Christ, except, perhaps, in very specifically pietistic or old orthodox circles?" "I do not know" - he concludes his article - "how they come to terms with the fact that on this point there is an undeniable error in the Bible, indeed, in Christ Himself. For us, the recognition of its error seems to be the way by which the idea of the Second Coming can find its way into the Christian consciousness of today. Its thereby required transfer from the sensual into the pictorial and symbolic ... are the necessary prerequisites to secure for it again a place in today's Christian spiritual world and to help it to the beneficial effect which also today's Christianity cannot do without." F. B.

German Mission in Palestine. There are six German societies working in the Holy Land: 1. the Jerusalemsverein in Berlin since 1852 in seven stations: Jerusalem, Jaffa-Savona, Haifa, Bethlehem, Bethjala, Hebron, and Beth-Sahour; 2. The Jerusalemsstiftung in Berlin since 1853; the Diakonissenverein in Kaiserswerth since 1851; the Syrian Orphanage in Cologne since 1860; the Brüder-Unität der Herrnhuter in Berthelsdorf since 1867; the Johanniter - Orden in Ballei-Brandenburg since 1851.

Tolerance in Church and State. Regarding the Los von Rom movement, the Jesuit Father Roh writes: "As often as this word - tolerance - is applied to people, it arouses in me an unspeakable repugnance; it grips me ice-cold to the heart. . . . The word in German is Duldung. But we need the word tolerate only when we are speaking of something that ought not to be, that we would like to see eliminated. Thus every animal tolerates certain tiresome tenants who do not pay their rent otherwise than by biting and stinging." - The Jesuit priest need only distinguish between the State and the Church, and everything is clear and simple. The Church, however, is not to tolerate heresy, e. g., Pabstism with its workmanship and tyranny. The State, however, owes to the various religious communities not merely tolerance, but freedom and completely equal rights. There can be no question of a contradiction here, for the very reason that toleration in the church is recognition as fellow believers, while in the State it is recognition as fellow citizens. The same persons can, without contradiction, deny one and the same person brotherhood in the church and confer citizenship in the state. By the way, the Father is quite right that there is something wrong, that there is something that ought not to be, when, for example, a Catholic State tolerates the Lutherans. But the wrong lies in the fact that in such a case the State does not give what it owes: complete freedom and equal rights instead of mere tolerance. When it is a question of different doctrines and church communities, tolerance is the right thing neither in the church nor in the state. Not in the church, for false doctrine is not to be tolerated there. Not in the state, for it owes to an ecclesiastical community not mere toleration, but complete liberty, equal rights, and equal treatment. If a Catholic State merely tolerates Protestants, it is not a praiseworthy thing, but, strictly speaking, an insult and a rape. F. B.'

The Conference of German Protestant Pastors in Great Britain assembled in Manchester towards the end of last year. German congregations are found in Barry, Bradford, Cardiff, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Hüll, Leith, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Middlesborough, Newcastle, South Shields, and Sunderland. In their composition these communities are very different. In some the merchant class predominates, others are based on artisan circles, still others are working-class.

Many of them have to do with the Seamen's Mission. At this year's conference, all places where there are congregations were represented. Altogether 19 preachers were present. It was the best attended of all (23) Conferences. The topics of discussion were "home visits" and the "Lutheran doctrine of justification". "One went back" - so it says in the report of the "A. E. L. K." - "to the psychological reasons which induced Luther to present his religious experience - similar to what Paul had done - in the form of the doctrine of justification." - The assertion that Luther took his doctrine of justification not from Scripture but from "his religious experience" is an anachronism: interpreting Luther's and the sixteenth-century theology according to the nineteenth-century "theology of experience" inaugurated by Schleiermacher. F. B.

Of the recently deceased Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple, the Scotchman W. Robertson Nicoll writes in the "British Weekly": "He leaves the relations between the Church of England and the Nonconformists more bitter than they have been for generations, and he has done nothing whatever to mitigate that bitterness." At one time, he said, Dr. Temple had been a Radical, Liberal, Antiritualist, and Temperance Reformer. But he died a "Tory and a nerveless Protestant, his physical debility being symbolical of his mental and religious faithlessness. He died leaving the Ritualists winning hands down, the Broad Church party, save for a few heroic figures, extinct, and Evangelicals broken-spirited." The Episcopalians, of course, judge differently. "The London Times" writes: "He was just the man to be as sturdy as an oak in the one case and as yielding as a willow in the other." The fact is that the ritualists have made great progress under Temple. In place of Dr. Temple, Thomas Davidson, Bishop of Winchester, who is characterized as a Broad Church Evangelical, has been appointed Archbishop of Canterbury by the present Prime Minister Balfour, who belongs to the Presbyterian Church. In the Anglican Church, too, this spectacle ("spectacle of a Presbyterian Bishopmaker") has often been felt as the deepest disgrace and unnaturalness. But one does not want to know anything about a dissolution of the unnatural connection between Church and State, from which such monstra originate. F. B.

Liberal theology in France. The leader of modern rationalism in the French Catholic Church is Mignot, Archbishop of Albi. He advocates that important changes be made in the seminaries; that those who wish to be ordained priests should first take a state examination in certain branches; that the medium of instruction should be French, not Latin; that the antiquated scholastic methods of teaching be replaced by modern ones; that ecclesiastical dogma be adapted to modern thought; that exegetical studies be given a more prominent place and the results of biblical criticism be accepted; that the theory of evolution be given its proper place in philosophy and theology, etc. This movement was opposed by Turinaz, Bishop of Nancy, in his work, "The Dangers Threatening Faith and Discipline in the French Church." He calls the conditions in the Catholic Church in France absolument effrayante. Thomas Aquinas is sought to be supplanted by Kant, and the Church Fathers by Wellhausen, Weizsäcker, and Harnack. The clerical press in France agrees with the Bishop of Nancy across the board. - Theologically the difference between the liberal and conservative Catholics of France is a slight one. Both are rationalists, and differ only in that the conservatives adhere to the reason of the pope, while the liberals prefer-.

to follow their own reason. In the rationalistic doctrine of works and the rejection of Scripture as the ultimate authority in matters of faith and life, the very essence of rationalism, both are in agreement. F. B.

Concerning the different behavior of the Pope in Italy and France, the Italian "Patria" writes: "When Italy wants to regulate the juridical relations of the family according to its laws, it is accused of tyranny against the Church; when divorce is to be introduced, there is a passionate protest against this usurpation of the alleged rights of the Holy See (although the Centrum für Deutschland is proud to have approved of the usurpation in the civil code). Every word, every wish, every simple objectively scientific treatment of an argument opposed by the clericals becomes a crime, a rape, a blasphemy, against which one appeals to all Europe. But when in France the Crucifix is banned from the schools, when the teaching of the Catechism is forbidden, when the government closes the clerical schools and institutions and expels the monks and nuns from their convents, then only a faint, scarcely audible wail answers from the Vatican, and both the Pope and Rampolla, who protest so loudly and noisily against every act in Italy, remain silent and' leave the responsibility for any resistance to the French bishops and clericals, even advising them, if possible, to submit to these 'ecclesiastical' laws out of prudence." - Where the pope cannot get everything, he takes what is to be had. But he is not satisfied until he has everything. F. B.

Purgatory still proves to be the main means to the highest end and summum bonum of the Roman priests: money. The Churchman reports: Alms for the souls in Purgatory are solicited in all Roman Catholic countries. We have often seen tins for this purpose at the church doors, over which were painted pictures of men and women writhing in chains and flames. Why not make this a little more realistic - thought the priest of San Carlos in Naples. He hid a man in a confessional near the pulpit, who illustrated the priest's sermon of the torments of the sweeping fire with howls, whimpers and rattling chains. The effect, however, was stronger than the priest had expected, for, seized with horror, the superstitious congregation fled in such haste that several persons were injured in the throng. Mickey Free summed up his total impression of Purgatory in the Roman church in the words of a "Churchman": "It is a very expansive place! " F. B.

Religious Freedom in Russia. According to a dispatch from Petersburg of March 12, the Emperor of Russia has issued a proclamation in which, among other reforms (e.g., the abolition of forced labor among the peasants), the introduction of religious freedom in Russia is promised. The text of the proclamation is available in the cable dispatch. But the English translation is obviously defective, and we therefore refrain from a literal citation. The essential content, however, is as follows: While the Greek Catholic Church is recognized as the ruling one, at the same time freedom of faith and religious practice is granted to the confessors of other religions, whether these (the confessors) be Russians or foreigners. At the same time it seems to be implied that by elevating the Greek-Catholic clergy intellectually the supremacy of the Greek-Catholic Church is to be ensured. Hopefully, Lutheran pastors in the Baltic provinces will now also be allowed to convert converts from the

Greek church into Lutheran congregations. Hitherto this was a crime in Russia, punishable by deportation to Siberia. The most recent proclamation of the Czar has an alarming addition. It calls upon the ministers and highest officials concerned to make known to him (the Tsar) their views concerning the implementation of the reforms mentioned in the proclamation. If the Czar is not on his guard, a great changeling may be foisted upon him. F. P.

Australian Protestant Defense Association. This is a political association in Australia, - "Orangeism minus the ritual". Purpose is to oust Catholics from state offices. "The Watchman," the organ of this connection, declares the Emancipation Act in England to be abortive. It reminds this connection of the A. P. A., which made a great stir in America some decades ago. Such connections owe their origin to the encroachments of the Romans, who seek to exploit politics in the interests of priestly rule. What is wrong with these connections is that they resort to false and dangerous means: they want to cast out the devil of priestly rule by the devil of secret unions. F. B.

Is Evolutionist Science Compatible with Bible Faith? In the "E. K. Z." of November 23 we read the following sentence: "We cannot, of course, write an apologetic treatise here, but that neither the Copernican world system, nor the Kant-Laplace theory of world formation, nor the theory of the descendency of organisms is incompatible with the faith of the Bible, is proved by many great naturalists of older and more recent times who are close to the same. - Does the "E. K. Z." mean to say by these words that the modern evolutionist sciences can be brought into harmony with Holy Scripture, or only that there are people who unite evolution and Christianity without it being possible to deny them Christianity without further ado? Probably the latter. But even this cannot be admitted. The miracle of creation is precisely a necessary condition of Christianity. He who denies Genesis 1 and teaches man's animal descent must also abandon the doctrine of the Fall. With this, however, the ground is pulled out from under Christianity's feet. Evolution and Christianity can neither logically nor psychologically dwell together. F. B.

Of progress in the natural and spiritual spheres, Macaulay says in his Little Writings: "That knowledge of our origin and destiny which we derive from revelation is indeed of great clarity and importance, but even revealed religion is not in the nature of a progressive science. All divine truth is recorded in the Bible. It is equally open to all who can read it in any age, and all the discoveries in the world cannot add a single verse to any of its books. It is clear, therefore, that no progress can take place in theology equal to that in chemistry, geology, or nautical science. A fifth-century Christian with a Bible is neither better nor worse off than a nineteenth-century Christian with a Bible - sincerity and natural acumen assumed to be equal. It means nothing that the compass, the printing press, gunpowder, and a thousand other discoveries and inventions have been made since. None of these has the slightest reference to the question whether man is justified by faith alone in Christ alone, or to other dogmas." - In theology there is indeed a subjective, but no objective progress. That is to say, the Christian is able to

In the sciences, on the other hand, there is not only a subjective but also an objective progress, for here we can not only acquire better and better the doctrines already drawn from facts, but also new ones. In the sciences, on the other hand, there is not only a subjective but also an objective progress, for here we can not only acquire better and better the doctrines already drawn from the facts, but also derive ever new doctrines from them, and thus constantly increase the stock of doctrines. F. B.

Superstition connected with the ringing of bells. A deep look into the views of the Bavarian people can be seen in a statement published in the "Jsarzeitung" by the Catholic helper Michael Knapp in Frauenliburg near Dingolfing. He had been reproached that he had not been able to prevent a hailstorm that had occurred on June 27. Since the bitter reproach is hurled in my face at every opportunity, as if I had not fulfilled my duty and task last Sunday, when the devastating hailstorm broke over our region, because I did not sound the storm bell, I can and must state that this was forbidden and prohibited to me more than a year ago by authoritative authorities: Therefore, it could not have been my duty to ring the bell on this unlucky day because of the thunderstorm, nor would it have been possible for me, since I could not notice the thunderstorm from my house, to arrive on the spot according to the wishes and wishes of the citizens of the community, since the thunderstorm broke almost immediately. In dry years, when rain was longed for, people often scolded me for ringing the bell; this time, because it was hailing, they scolded me for not ringing the bell - a hard thing to do to please everyone. I must therefore reject these unjust reproaches and insults on the part of the parishioners." You see, these Bavarian peasants still take literally the Roman Pontificale's assertion that the consecration of bells gives ringing the power to drive away evil spirits and thunderstorms. Who can blame them? The Freiburger katholische Kirchenlexikon writes in its new edition, completed only last year: "By virtue of the prayer and the consecration of the Church of Jesus Christ, the bells still have a special power, which many bell inscriptions express briefly with the words: Pello nociva, fugo daemonia, fulgura frango .

Baumgarten von Kiel as a modern pedagogue. In a lecture on Luther's Small Catechism, Baumgarten said: "A child is led to lie if one demands of him that he should find the confession of his own faith in the words of the second article: 'I believe that Christ is my Lord, who has redeemed me, a lost and damned man. For the child does not feel himself to be 'lost and damned'; and if we artificially inoculate him with such a consciousness of sin, so that he thoughtlessly recites the words without feeling them himself, we sin against his sense of truth. We tempt it to see in religion word-making and lip-service, we tempt it to think as if one had not to take its religious convictions so seriously." - Children are sinners too, and their own consciences testify to that. But to teach children the truth and to convince them of the truth is not immoral. But it is immoral for Baumgarten, who denies the resurrection of Christ, to pretend to be a Christian, even a teacher of Christianity. And as far as pedagogy is concerned, if Baumgarten were right, its supreme sentence would have to be: One may teach others only what they already know and feel!

F. B.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 49. **April 1903.** **No. 4.**

Recent Pentateuch Criticism.

(Continued.)

I.

1. the self-testimony of the Pentateuch.

To the question, Who is the author of the Pentateuch? the Scriptures give a clear, definite answer, saying, Moses wrote the Pentateuch. In view of the confident assertions of modern critics, who almost unanimously deny that Moses wrote the five books, it will not be superfluous if we briefly consider the main statements of Scripture. The first and oldest evidence for this is the self-statements of the Pentateuch. We first read expressly that Moses wrote out individual, especially important events. When the children of Israel under Joshua's leadership had defeated the Amalekites, the Lord said to Moses: "Write this in a book as a memorial," Ex 17:14. Here we have God's express command to Moses to write, the impulsus ad scribendum, and although these words only mean that Moses was to write down this report of the defeat of the Amalekites, the addition of the word "in a book" suggests that Moses also wrote down other deeds of God. We soon read that Moses also wrote down other events. When the Lord of Sinai had given His law and all His judgments to the people, and had made a covenant with them, then "Moses wrote," as it is expressly said, "all the words of the Lord," the very laws and judgments of the Lord which are now given, and which have been written out in the preceding chapters and verses. 24:4, 7. The book of the covenant was called the book of the covenant, because in it was recorded the making of the covenant and the law of the covenant. When Jehovah made a new covenant with Israel through Moses after the idolatry of the people with the calf that had been poured out

and the individual regulations, he said to him at the end: "Write these words; for according to these words I have made a covenant with you and with Israel", 2 Mos. 34, 27. When the forty years' wandering in the wilderness drew to a close, a detailed account of the journeys and camps of the people, some of which had already been mentioned in the historical account of the second and fourth books of Moses, is given, and introduced with these words: "And Moses described their departure, how they went, according to the commandment of the LORD; and these are the journeys of their journey," Numbers 33:2. 33, 2. When Moses' time was at an end, and the LORD announced to him his soon death, and the future apostasy of the people, he at the same time commanded him and Joshua his successor to write a song, which should be a witness among the children of Israel, saying, "Write ye therefore this song, and teach it the children of Israel," 5 Mos. 31, 19. V. 22. it is then said, "So Moses wrote this song at the same time, and taught it the children of Israel," and we find this song in Deut. 32 as an appendix to the book of the law.

Now what is said in these passages about the individual important occurrences and pieces mentioned, that Moses wrote them down, is finally said of the whole fifth sacred work. Near the end of the fifth book, after Moses' departure and Joshua's investiture, it is written in the chapter just cited: "And Moses wrote this law, and gave it to the priests, to the children of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the LORD, and to all the elders of Israel; and commanded them, saying: For seven years at a time, in the year of remission, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel shall come to appear before the LORD thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt cause this law to be proclaimed before all Israel in their ears," Deut. 5. 31, 9-11. And after a few more provisions had been given, it is said again, and more fully, "Now when Moses had written out the words of this law wholly in a book" (Literally: When Moses had finished writing the words of this law upon a book, XXX-XXX XXXXX-XXXXX XXXX-XX XXXX XXXXX XXX), "he commanded the Levites that bare the ark of the testimony of the LORD, saying, Take the book of this law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the LORD your God, that there it may be a witness against thee," Deut. 5. 31, -26. Since that time the Pentateuch has been established as a definite quantity under the names of "the book of the law," "the law of Moses," "the book of Moses," or simply "the law," has been known and circulated among the people of Israel, and has been universally and unopposedly acknowledged as the work of Moses, as we shall see later.

Now how does modern criticism come to terms with this self-testimony of the Pentateuch? It does away with it summarily, and "positive" as well as "negative" critics agree in this. Let us hear some of their representatives. The

Strack, who is considered positive, says: "The self-testimony of the Pentateuch has been wrongly invoked, e. g. by Keil, § 23. The Pentateuch nowhere claims to be written by Moses himself; for Ex. 17, 14. 24, 4. 7. 34, 27. Num. 33, 2. refer only to, though important details and the Book of the Covenant, and Deut. 31, 9-11. 22. 24-26. refers only to the Torah contained in Deuteronomy. Ex. 17, 14. E^1) God commands Mofe to write the victory over Amaleq in a book for remembrance. . . . Of course, Moses carried out the command; but that just Ex. 17, 8-13. provides the execution is not said. Num. 33, the list of the stations, has, according to v. 2, a scripture from Moses himself as its basis, but it cannot be this scripture itself; for it is incomplete in a strange way, and we are unable to gain from it a clear idea of the real characteristics of the Israelites. 2) Volck, who is considered even more positive, has a similar opinion: "That the Pentateuch (or more correctly the Hexateuch) is based on various source writings, can be denied by no one who impartially gives himself to the impression which this work of history makes on the reader. Nor can it be derived from Moses himself. Nowhere does it claim to have been written by Moses in the form in which it is presented to us. Only certain things are said to have been written by him (Ex. 17, 14. 24,4. 34,27. Num. 33, 2. Deut. 31, 9. 22. 24.)." 3) Cornill, the radical critic, who follows Wellhausen's line, says: "That this assumption (that Moses was the author of the Book of Five) could be formed, we easily understand; but it lacks, above all, the self-witness of the Pentateuch. Neither by superscription nor by introduction nor in any other way does the Pentateuch itself claim to be written by Moses; it tells of Moses throughout in the third person, and the way in which certain parts of the Pentateuch, the judgment of Amalek, Ex. 17, 14, the book of the covenant, Ex. 24, 4, the so-called second decalogue, Ex. 34, 27, the book of the stations, Ex. 34, 27, and the book of the prophets, Ex. 24, 4, are written by Moses himself. 34, 27, the list of stations, Num. 33, 2, and several times in Deuteronomy, 31, 9. 22. 24, the writing down by Moses himself is expressly emphasized, leads rather to the conclusion that just thereby this quality should be denied to the rest of the Pentateuch." 4) And in the very latest, quite liberal, "Handcommentar zum Alten Testament, in Verbindung mit anderen Fachgelehrten herausgegeben von Dr. W. Nowack," which is especially full of higher criticism, it is said on this point: "More weight has the evidence from express statements of the Pentateuch about a scriptural-

1) This E is to indicate that, in Strack's opinion, this verse comes from one of the source writings of the Pentateuch, from the so-called "Elohist."

2) "Introduction to the Old Testament." Fourth Edition, p. 24.

3) "Holy Scripture and Criticism." p. 83 f.

4) "Introduction to the Old Testament." Second edition, p. 16 f.

The activity of Moses as a writer. Such are found in Ex. 17, 14. 24, 4. ff. 34, 27. f. Num. 33, 2. Deut. 31, 9. ff. 24. ff. All these passages, however, always refer only to individual matters within the Pentateuch, and it is not justified without further ado to conclude from them that Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch; for the possibility exists that individual records of Moses are included in the Pentateuch. . . . . Furthermore, it is argued that the Pentateuch is a planned work in all its parts, down to the last detail, and that therefore, if individual parts were written by Moses, the whole must be derived from him. But apart from the fact that such a systematicity does not exist in reality, one must ask whether a systematic work cannot also contain older materials. Finally, however, it must be considered that the very fact that individual parts of the work are traced back to Moses speaks against the whole being derived from him; for why is the same thing nowhere said of the whole? And if it is to apply to the whole, why is it still expressly said of individual parts?" 1)

We see: the objections raised against the self-testimony of the Pentateuch - apart from the unfounded assertions and suspicions - amount to the fact that the literary activity of Moses stated therein refers at best only to individual passages and that also the summary testimony in the fifth book: "When Moses had finished writing the words of this law on a book", Deut. 31, 24, refers only to the law contained in Deuteronomy, not also to the preceding four books. Now are these objections really well founded? Not at all. If we look at the passages cited without prejudice, they say: Moses wrote this and wrote that; he wrote at different times and in different places; he wrote again and again. And at last it is said in Deuteronomy, "He finished writing." What other impression does one get than this: Moses spent years writing a great work? He began it at the very beginning of his journey through the wilderness, and now, shortly before his death, he has finished it. The very expression "to finish" implies not only a beginning, but also a continuation. If we now refer the "finishing" only to the law contained in Deuteronomy, with the exclusion of the first four books, then the correlate to "finishing" is missing, since there is no other mention of a literary activity of Moses in Deuteronomy, except in the 31st chapter mentioned. Instead, then, of concluding with the critics: Because in the passages cited the writing down by Moses himself is expressly emphasized, the

1) "Uebersetzung und Erklärung der Bücher Deuteronomium und Josua und Allgemeine Einleitung in den Hexateuch" by Lic. Dr. Carl Steuernagel, p. 253.

The fact that the other parts of the Pentateuch were not written by Moses should rather be concluded in a reasonable way, especially if one adds the other reasons for the authorship of Moses that will be given later: What is expressly said in these passages about individual parts of the Book of Five is then true of the whole work: Moses wrote it. It also happens elsewhere in Scripture that in a larger work, in individual passages, the writer is expressly instructed to "write," without it being said of the other parts of the book that they did not come from this writer. (Is. 8, 1. 30, 8. Jer. 30, 2. 36, 28. Hab. 2, 2.)

Above all, it is not true that the words in the 31st chapter of Deuteronomy: "Moses wrote this law," "When Moses finished writing the words of this law in a book," apply only to the law contained in the fifth book, as modern criticism since Franz Delitzsch, Kurtz and Riehm has maintained almost unanimously. They also refer to the law contained in the four preceding books, and thus declare the whole five-book to be written by Moses. As this is an important point, let us consider it a little more closely. The first question is, What do the words "this law," XXXXX-XXXXX, mean? The expression occurs fifteen times in Deuteronomy, so it is a common, quite definite term in this book. We find it for the first time right at the beginning of the book, where it says: "Beyond the Jordan, in the land of Moab, Moses began to interpret this law" (XXXX XXXXX-XXXX XXX), Deut. 1, 5. Already this passage decides about the meaning of the term "this law". It cannot, as the moderns would have it, refer to what now follows, to the very Deuteronomy promulgated in the regions of Moab, but must refer to the law found in the earlier books, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. The expression "this law" does not point forward in the sense of "the instruction that now follows," but rather backward: Moses began (XXXXX) to interpret this Torah, this instruction that God had long since opened to him and had already communicated to the people. This is what the expression XXX, interpret, demands. One can only interpret or explain something that already exists. All the arts of modern critics and exegetes, to give the word XXX another meaning: "to make known, to present publicly," 1) "to present," 2) "to inculcate, to impress," 3) in order to refer just "this law" only to what follows, fail because of the use of the language. For in the two other places where it occurs in the Old Testament, it means nothing else than "to make clear, to make plain," Deut. 27, 8, Hab. 2, 2, and transferred from this to our

1) So Dillmann to the spot.
2) Thus Marti in Kautzsch's modern-theological translation of the Old Testament.
3) Thus Valeton in his Studies, VI, p. 304.

Place "explain, interpret." This meaning it then still demonstrably has in the post-biblical Hebrew; in the Septuagint it is rendered διασαφ^σαι (to make clear, to explain), and is also so explained by all recent dictionaries. Gesenius in his "Thesaurus" renders it as 6xplieuit, Mühlau-Volck: explain, erläutern, eruere sensum; Buhl: explain, Siegfried-Stade: explain a book. Therefore, even König, one of the first Hebraists of the present time, although he opposes hand and foot the Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch, and especially the given explanation of our passage, must nevertheless, as a linguist, make this concession, that "most probably 'erläutern' should mean", and that it "seems very daring not to leave to this that inauthentic term which has been conceded to it by the entire old tradition, and which has received citizenship in post-biblical Hebrew". 1) And also the context demands that the term "this law" be applied not only to the provisions contained in the fifth book, but also to the laws contained in the earlier books. For Moses now identifies "this law" with the law given at Horeb or Sinai, and expressly repeats the ten commandments given at that time, Deut. 4, 10. ff. 44. 5, 1. ff. This indisputable fact is not changed by the objection of the critics that it is often said: "this law, which I set before you this day", Deut. 4, 8, that therefore only the law contained in Deuteronomy is meant. (Cf. also 27:1.) For these passages, according to the fundamental passage, Deut. 1:5, can only mean: I present this law to you today, explaining and interpreting it. The law was already there before the explanation, as Moses, before he explains it, expressly says: "Behold, I have taught you (XXXXX) commandments and statutes, as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should so do in the land whither ye are come to possess it. Keep it therefore, and do it," Deut. 4:5. f.

Against this interpretation it could be objected that even if the expression "this law", Deut. 1, 5, really refers to the law contained in the earlier books, it does not mean that this earlier law was already written at that time. Moses had just explained the earlier given, but at that time still unwritten regulations and this explanation he then put in writing. The passages in Deut. 31:9, 24 refer to this, and say nothing about the writing of the first four books by Moses. We answer: It is certainly best to understand the expression "this law" as referring to the law that had already been written down, since we know from the passages cited above that Moses had already written down the first four books.

1) "Introduction to the Old Testament," pp. 137 f.

has written. We also have good reasons, as we will see later, that Gen. 1, 1. to 4 Mos. 36, 13. were already written at that time. But it can also be shown from Deuteronomy itself that our passage must be understood from the written law. Let us keep in mind what the expression "this law" means here: the already existing law, which Moses now had to explain further. And of this it now says Deut. 17, 18. f.: "And when he (the king) shall sit upon the throne of his kingdom, he shall take this other law" (literally a copy of this law, XXXX XXXXX XXXX-XX) "from the priests, the Levites, and have it written in a book. And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life, that he may learn to fear the LORD his God, to keep all the words of this law, and these statutes, to do them." But how could Moses have spoken of a "copy of this law" if "this law" had not already been written? Or how could the future king have kept "all the words of this law" (XXXX XXXXX XXXX-XX) if, for instance, the earlier laws had existed only in oral tradition and not in written record? Admittedly, here again the critics have sought excuses; they again understand by "this law" only Deuteronomy, and even invoke Jewish tradition for this purpose. Quite wrongly. The Septuagint has indeed translated the words "a copy of this law" in a fundamentally wrong way with τό δευτερονόρ,υ" τοῦτη; the Vulgate then followed it with the translation "Deuteronomium legis hujus," and from this wrong translation the wrong relation to Deuteronomy alone has arisen. The old Chaldean translator, however, and the old Jewish rabbis translated the words correctly as "duplication (of a writing), copy, copy," 1) which meaning is also recognized by the dictionary of Gesenius-Buhl.

Important is also the passage Deut. 28, 58. ff. There God announces to the people that if they do not do "all the words of this law that are written in this book", he will give them "all the plagues of Egypt", "and all sickness and all plagues that are not written in the book of this law". Two kinds of visitations are thus distinguished here: such plagues as are not written in the book of this law, and the plagues of Egypt. Because of the contrast, by the latter are to be understood such diseases and plagues as are recorded in the book of the law as having happened in Egyptian times: Cattle plague, pox, frogs, locusts, hail, darkness, etc. But where are these plagues and diseases written? Nowhere else than in Exodus, which is clearly referred to here, Exodus 8-12.

1) The evidence for this in Hävernick-Keil, "Specielle Einleitung in den Pentateuch". Second edition, p. 25.

And finally there is a strong and striking proof that "this law" is not only Deuteronomy, as the modern critics claim. Deut. 31, 9. ff. And Moses wrote this law, and gave it to the priests, to the children of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the LORD, and to all the elders of Israel, and commanded them, saying, For seven years, in the time of the passover, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel cometh to appear before the LORD thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt cause this law to be proclaimed before all Israel in their ears: Namely, before the congregation of the people, both of the men, and of the women, children, and of thy stranger that is within thy gates: that they may hear, and learn, that they may fear the LORD their God, and keep, that they may do all the words of this law." "This law" was thus to be read every seven years at the Feast of Tabernacles. Now it is said of the first celebration of this feast, which is narrated to us more closely, under Ezra and Nehemiah, thus: "And the law of God was read every day, from the first day even unto the last: and they kept the feast seven days, and on the eighth day the assembly, as it was meet," Neh. 8:18. (Cf. also the description of the feast, vv. 15-17.) What then was the "law of God"? Only Deuteronomy? It would have to be, if the critics were right. But no, it was the five books of Moses known by the name of the "Book of the Law." For v. 14, it is said, "that they found it written in the law, which the Lord commanded by Moses, that the children of Israel should dwell in tabernacles for the feast of the seventh month." And where did they find the ordinance of the feast of tabernacles, of the eight days' feast? Not in Deuteronomy, but in Leviticus. (Cf. Deut. 23:34-43.) So also the third book of Moses was read at that time, and this reading was a part of the execution of the divine command to read "this law" at the feast of tabernacles, Deut. 31:10. f.

Let us return to our starting point. According to what has been said, the expression "this law" in Deuteronomy is not only to be understood as the fifth book, but as the entire unified work; and when it is said near the end of Deuteronomy: "Moses wrote this law," "When Moses finished writing the words of this law in a book," this refers not only to Deuteronomy, but to the entire fifth book, which is closely connected in its individual parts. The first proof that Mofes is the author of the Pentateuch is the enormous self-testimony of the Pentateuch.

(To be continued.) L. F.

A study of the death of our Lord on the cross.

(Conclusion.)

The sermon of Christ's death on the cross fills us with comfort and hope. "Who will condemn us? Christ is here who died," Rom. 8:34. "What then can the multitude of sins hurt me? I am with God in grace; the debt is all paid by Christ's own blood." (Song 94, 3.) Tu peccatorum meorum Judex eris, qui pro peccatis meis mortuus.... Pater tradidit judicium Filio, sed Filius vicissim propter peccata nostra traditus est" (Gerhard, "Med. Sacr." XLV.) The word of the cross of Christ makes us confident even in death. Why should a Christian fear death? Through Christ's death his death is conquered and swallowed up forever, Is. 25, 8. 1 Cor. 15, 55. It has become "a mockery out of death," the Lamb's "blood draws our door, that faith holds out against death, the strangler cannot touch us." (Song 99:4, 5.) This is the only comfort to the awakened, terrified conscience in the wide world, that Christ died for our sin. "One knows several histories that the barefoot monks, when they had long vowed their order and good works in vain to some good consciences at the hour of death, that they finally had to keep silent of their order and St. Francis and say this word: 'Dear man, Christ died for you!' This alone has refreshed and cooled in anguish, and given peace and consolation." (Apology, Müller, p. 90.) 1) It is not absolutely necessary for a blessed end that a Christian should express joy in dying; much less does such an expression contribute anything to a blessed departure; but faith in Christ's death may produce a special willingness and a moving joy in dying as the last noble fruit. "As nearly as I should resist, if any one teaches me that I should go into a monastery, if I would be blessed: so nearly also should I resist, if any one at the last end would set up my dying or suffering for my consolation and hope, as if it should be of use to me for the washing away of my sins. For

1) According to the "Formula Consolandi Aegrotos" of Anselmus, the priest should have the following conversation with the sick person: "Credis, quod pro te est mortuus Dominus Jesus Christus? Resp. Etiam. . . . Credis, te non posse nisi per ejus mortem salvari ? Etiam. ... In *hac sola morte* totam fiduciam constitue, in nulla alia re habeas fiduciam, *huic morti te totum committe, hac sola te totum* contege, hac morte te totum involve. Et si Dominus tuus te voluerit judicare, dic: Domine, mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi objicio inter me et tuum judicium; . . . mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi pono inter te et mea peccata; . . . . mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi obtendo inter me et merita mea ipsiusque meritum offero p ro merito, quod ego debuissem habere, nec habeo; . . . . mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi oppono inter me et iram tuam." (Gerhard, loc. de morte, c. X. Cf. Walther, "Pastorale," p. 303.)

Both are denying God and his Christ, blaspheming his grace, and perverting his gospel. But they do much better who hold up a crucifix to the dying and exhort them to the death and passion of Christ. . . Thus some books go astray, in which St. Augustine's and other sayings are puffed up, how death is a door to life and a remedy against sin; so it is not seen that such is to be understood of Christ's death and suffering." (Luther. XI, 528 f.) In the last difficult hour, pray to our crucified Lord: "Appear to me as a shield, as a comfort in my death, and let me see your image in your crucifixion. Then will I look unto thee, then will I with faith press thee close to my heart: he that dieth thus dieth well."

But in the meantime, from our conversion to the blessed hour of death, the preaching of our Lord's death on the cross also has this effect, that it stirs us to godliness. 2 Cor. 5, the apostle says that he is diligent to please the Lord and to serve his church, so that he may be praised by them, vv. 6, 7, 9-13. But what is the driving force of this diligence in godliness in his case? "The love of Christ urges us on, because we hold that if one died for all, they all died. And therefore he died for them all, that they which live should not live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again," v. 14. f. To godliness belongs the denial of the world and the lust of the world. Gal. 6:14. says the apostle, "But let it be far from me to boast, but only of the cross of our Lord JEsu Christ, by whom the world is crucified to me, and I to the world." Christians and the children of this world are divorced people, the cross of Christ separates them. The "great, heavy suffering" of JEsu admonishes the Christian, "Shun all wickedness; behold how so faithfully the majesty of the Son of God hath taken hold of thee in adversity." (Song 288:12.) It is said of the Christian, "Shall I have a desire to do this, and not avoid what God Himself must atone for with such great suffering?" (Song 76:4.) And, "If then my corrupt flesh and blood will feast in lust, I remember thy suffering; soon all will be well." 1) To godliness belongs self-denial. "Verus Christi discipulus propriae voluntati renuntiat et divinam voluntatem sequi desiderat. Adspice Christum; is in agone passionis constitutus propriam voluntatem tanquam gratissimum sacrificium Deo offert: offeras et tu propriam Deo voluntatem, et sic perficies eam, quam Christus requirit, tui abnegationem." (Gerhard, "Med. Sacr." XXXI.) To godliness belongs sincere, active charity, love of the

1) So originally by Heermann; cf. reworked form in unserm Gesangbuch, No. 77, 2.

And to this we are provoked by the love of Him who loved us unto death. Of Jesus the Evangelist says: "When Jesus knew that his time was come to depart out of this world unto the Father, even as he loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end. And as the Lord then connects to the washing of the feet reported in this chapter the admonition: "An example have I given you, that ye should do as I have done unto you," v. 15, so he especially connected the reference to his soon coming end with an admonition to brotherly love: "Dear little children, I am yet with you a little while. . . And now I say unto you, A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. 1) By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another," vv. 33-35; and, "This is my commandment, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends. You are my friends, if you do what I command you", Cap. 15, 12-14. To godliness, to sincere love for one's neighbor also belongs love for the enemy, reconciliation, the willingness to forgive the enemy. The suffering Redeemer, who even at the last tried to save Judas, who saved Peter, who still pleaded for his murderers on the cross, provokes and teaches me "how I should adorn my heart with quiet, gentle courage, and how I should love those who grieve me greatly with the works of wickedness. (Song 89:13.) More than three hundred years ago a pastor had an enemy in his congregation who caused him much heartache; the adversary came to a terrible end, being put to death by the sword. While the preacher has faithfully recorded many of his experiences for the benefit of his children and children's children, he writes, on the other hand, where he comes to speak of that disturber of the peace, briefly, but excellently: "I leave the trade undisclosed and unreported, indeed, buried under the heart of Christ." (See "Freikirche," 23, p. 101.) Thus we are to bury painful memories, grievances suffered, which will not leave our minds, under the cross of Christ, and beseech the Crucified that He Himself may take from our souls all rancor, all spite and enmity, and teach us "to forgive our neighbor his debts gladly and willingly." (Song 89:14.) Patience in suffering also belongs to godliness; we Christians must go through much tribulation into the kingdom of God, Acts 14:22. 14, 22. God chastens those whom he loves, Heb. 12, 6. The converted thief also had his legs broken, Joh. 19, 32. to which Bengel remarks: "Etiam conversis saepe restant dolores, et par cum impiis miseria corporis externa." But with respect to His death, the Saviour Himself, even before His suffering of our affliction, had

1) "Sermo *bis* ponitur: primum simpliciter, deinde cum epitasi." (Bengel.)

He said: "If anyone would come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me", Matth. 16, 24. On the other hand: "Whoever does not take up his cross and follow Me is not worthy of Me", Matth. 10, 38. And in both passages He adds: "Whoever finds his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life for My sake will find it". In the history of the passion itself the evangelists want to teach us to carry the cross after the Lord by the example of Simon of Cyrene (Matth. 27, 32. Marc. 15, 21. Luc. 23, 26.), by the example of the mother of Jesus (Joh. 19, 25. ff.; cf. Luc. 2, 35.). Under the burden of the cross, "patience is necessary for us, that we may do the will of God and receive the promise," Heb. 10:36. But it is under the cross of Christ that we learn to "run with patience into the battle that is appointed for us, and look to Jesus, the beginner and perfecter of faith, who, when he might have had joy, endured the cross, and did not fear the shame. . . Remember him that endured such contradiction of sinners against him, that ye faint not in your courage, and be loosed," Heb. 12:1-3. Under the cross of Christ we learn "much rather to suffer mischief with the people of God, than to have the temporal enjoyment of sin," and esteem "the reproach of Christ for . . Riches," Heb. 11:25, 26. "JEsus, that he might sanctify the people by his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us therefore go forth unto him out of the camp, 1) and bear his reproach," Heb. 13:12. f. Thus the preaching of our Lord's death on the cross provokes us to manifold evidences of true godliness. "If any sorrow or sickness trouble thee, think how small it is in comparison with the crown of thorns and nails of Christ. If thou must do, or forbear, that which disgust thee, think how Christ is bound and led captive hither and thither. If pride offend thee, behold how thy Lord is mocked, and despised with the thorns. If unchastity and lust offend thee, think how bitterly Christ's tender flesh is scourged, pierced, and pierced. If hatred and envy offend thee, or thou seekest vengeance: remember how Christ, with many tears and cries, hath pleaded for thee and all his enemies, who would have smelt cheaper. If thou be troubled with any affliction, bodily or spiritual, strengthen thine heart, and say, Why should not I also suffer a little affliction, if my Lord sweat blood in the garden for fear and sorrow? That is a slothful and shameful servant, which would lie on his bed, when his lord is in distress of death. Behold, against all vice and unrighteousness there is strength and refreshment in Christ.

1) This meant for the Jewish Christians at first: "extra Judaismum" (Bengel), for us Christians in general: "Foris ille ut noxius quidam et latro cruci affigitur. Nec nos itaque pudeat, *ex hoc mundo* excedere, et *honores et gloriam, quae mundi* sunt, destituere." (Theophylact; see Calov, "Bibl. Illustr.")

find. And this is rightly considered Christ's suffering, these are the fruits of His suffering." (Luther. XI, 582 f.)

So let Christ our Lord, who died for us on the cross, reign in us and over us. "When a king dies, a new one is sought, but Christ first rises when he is dead, and possesses his kingdom in a mighty way. (Luther.) Let us persevere in preaching Christ crucified, and not be ashamed of his gospel. "Nos stultitiam evangelii praedicamus, in quo alia justitia revelata est, videlicet, quod propter Christum propitiatorem justi reputemur, cum credimus, nobis Deum propter Christum placatum esse. Nec ignoramus, quantum haec doctrina abhorreat a judicio rationis ac legis. Nec ignoramus multo speciosiorem esse doctrinam legis de dilectione. [1]) Est enim sapientia. Sed non pudet nos stultitiae evangelii. Id propter gloriam Christi defendimus et rogamus Christum, ut Spiritu Sancto suo adjuvet nos, ut id illustrare ac patefacere possimus." (Apology, Müller, p. 126.) We will proclaim the death of our Lord till he come, 1 Cor. 11, 26.

Our great sin and grievous iniquity
Jesus, the true Son of God, to the cross. Therefore we, poor Judas, and the multitude of the Jews, may not reproach thee with enmity; for the guilt is ours. Blessed art thou, O Christ, who didst hang on the cross, And for our sin didst receive much reproach and chastisement. Now reignest thou with thy Father in the kingdom of heaven;
Make us all blessed in this earthly realm. Kyrieleison.

(Luther. X, 1472 f.)

Ms. B.

Religion in the state schools.

(Continued.)

If we now ask: How did the United States arrive at this freedom, the answer is often: We owe religious freedom to the Puritan fathers who were persecuted in England and sought and found the longed-for freedom in America. As the Lutheran Observer of November 21, 1902, writes: "Our institutions were imbedded in the truths, principles, and life of the Christian settlers who determined the organization of the colonies, having come to these shores, largely, in heroic loyalty to Christian convictions and the supremacy of the divine authority, fully deserving the praise: 'Amidst the storm they sang, And the stars heard and the sea, And the sea heard, And the stars heard, And the sea heard.

1) That we may be justified by our love and law-keeping.

the sounding aisles of the dim woods rank to the anthems of the free." But this is to turn the facts upside down. In New England, New York, Virginia, Carolina, and other states, the persecuting Puritans, Episcopalians, and other reformed sects have stained the first pages of American history with abominations against religious liberty, of which their children are now ashamed. The freedom these fathers sought consisted in claiming for themselves the right to rape and bloodily persecute others for the sake of their faith. Cobb writes, "It is evident that the Puritans of Massachusetts were zealous for their own freedom. They did not want the Church of England forced on them by the king, nor did they want religious liberty for any others than themselves." (p. 150.) In accordance with the reformed symbols, they taught that it was the duty of the state to root out heresy with its representatives. And as they taught, so they practiced, and did not even shrink from the death penalty against dissenters. Yes, even our country has gone through a long period of state-church intolerance and persecution. And if anything is clear in the world, it is that America owes her religious liberty not to the Puritan fathers, whom the Observer praises, but to the special providence and direction of God. It is not through the Puritans, but in spite of them, that America has become religiously free. God has so used and directed circumstances and persons that a liberty has come forth of which the Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and Reformed would know nothing. The envy of the sects, the unchurched masses, the indifferentism, the prevalence of the Unitarians, the French unbelief, the tyranny of the English, and many other circumstances, were means in God's hand to give religious liberty to our country. The separation of church and state has often been forced upon the sects, and especially upon their preachers. That Joseph became lord of Egypt, he owed not to his brethren, but to the government of God. And when we see from history how the Puritans and Episcopalians have resisted religious liberty, we must also exclaim, "Ye thought to make it evil, but God thought to make it good. Ye thought to raise up and maintain state churches with compulsion of faith and persecution, but God thought to make America the haven of religious liberty."

How long and how tenaciously the sects in America have resisted the complete separation of church and state with their religious equality, for this only some data. In Virginia, the Episcopal State Church was abolished in the Legislature of 1798-1799; but the last traces of the connection between State and Church did not disappear until 1840. In Connecticut, a law was passed as late as 1791, according to which Dissenters

could only be exempted from tithing for the state church if they had had themselves judicially enrolled as members of dissenting churches. The penalty for "non-attendance upon church" was revoked in 1816 after a hot struggle, and in the following year the state church there also fell. The Legislature of 1818 determined "that the exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without distinction, shall be forever free to all persons in this state. No preference shall be given by any law to any Christian sect or mode of worship."
A later legislature decreed that Jews should also be granted the same freedom. In Maryland, after a long struggle, the theocracy fell only in 1833. In Pennsylvania, "the religious test for office" was abolished in 1790. But as a condition precedent to the free exercise of religion, "belief in a future state of rewards and punishments" was added as a second to the already existing provision "acknowledgment of Almighty God." This law was confirmed in 1837 and is still law (dead letter) in Pennsylvania. In 1824, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court also ruled that the 1700 law was still rightly in existence, punishing anyone "who shall willfully, premeditatedly, and despitefully blaspheme, or speak lightly or profanely of Almighty God, Christ Jesus, the Holy Spirit, or the Scriptures of Truth." In New Hampshire, it was not until 1819 that a resolution granting religious freedom to all "Christian sects" was enforced. And in the revised Constitution of this state of 1889 the provision is still found (admittedly also only as a dead letter): "Every denomination of Protestant Christians, demeaning themselves quietly and as good subjects of the state, shall be equally under the protection of the law." Repeated attempts to strike out the words "of Protestant Christians" have so far failed. In 1831, "religious tests" were abolished in Delaware. In Vermont, as late as 1801, a law was passed taxing anyone who had not declared in writing that he disagreed with the majority for the "town church," and it was not until 1807 that the state here also severed its connection with the church. - It took many protracted and bitter struggles until the slogan of the complete divorce between State and Church and of religious liberty and equality, which the Constitution of the Federal Government had issued, was generally accepted and carried out. Therefore, it is no wonder (by the way) that today we still come across some consequences and remnants that logically contradict the American principle.

But as in the past, so in the present there are still many pseudo-Americans who long for the fleshpots of the state religions and churches in Massachusetts, Virginia and Carolina, in which they spread their faith with state money and build their churches.

can fill with the beadle of state. According to Archbishop Jreland, it is the expressed aim of the Roman hierarchy to catholicize the American state. The National Reform Association, the Reformed Presbyterians and others insist that the American state as such profess Christianity and make the appropriate changes in the constitutions, statutes and schools without delay. Many Episcopalians cannot wait for the day when they will be recognized by the state as the "American Church," as they now often call themselves. During the illness of Edward VII, the Bishop of London, as "representative of the English nation," prayed, "O Lord, save the King." To this the "Churchman" remarked, "How beautiful if the same could have been done at McKinley, if a bishop in Washington, as the representative of the nation, had spoken to the nation of its Creator and its dependence upon Him. He concludes with the suggestion, "The Bishop of Washington has secured a worthy location for such a cathedral." And the same Presbyterians and Congregationalists who are indignant at the English school law now passed, because it rapes the conscience of the Dissenters and compels them to pay taxes for schools in which a religion is taught which they cannot approve and control, are not tired of agitating at their meetings and in their papers for the introduction of religious instruction in the State schools here. 1) It is no exaggeration to say that the great majority of all sectarian preachers are against the existing separation of State and religion, and therefore also against full religious liberty and equality. The American principle of the complete separation of church and state is a thorn in their side. And they believe that they can only do their duty as Christians by making the Christian religion a matter of state. How could this be otherwise, since all reformed symbols make it the duty of the state to spread the true religion and to eradicate false religions? A good Zwinglian and Calvinist is, so far as religious liberty is concerned, eo ipso a bad and dangerous American. The "Independent" also confesses that there is little understanding and love among the American sects for the principle of the complete separation of church and state, when it writes on October 16: "And yet

1) In its number of February 28, the "Congregationalist," referring to the Education Act in England, writes: "The trend of all the best thought and life of the world is against the ancient claim of union between spiritual and temporal power." "The conviction of democracy is that the less the church has to do with the State in official ways, the better." Of March 14, on the other hand, the same paper writes of religious instruction in the American public schools: "The net result will mean infinite good to coming generations of citizens and churchmen." Still the same intolerant Puritans who refuse to change what they claim for themselves!

the great principle which separates the secular function of the State from the religious function of the Church is only blindly seen by many good people."

The fact that there are still many opponents of the separation of church and state in America has been proven by numerous examples in recent years. In many cases there has been a formal storm-running for the introduction of religion and the Bible into the state schools. The chief inducement to this movement was the assassination of McKinley. The song, "The world (especially America) is becoming more and more pious," which was sung in mass choirs at the dawn of the twentieth century, had not yet died away when the opposite melody, "The world is becoming more and more godless," was already being sung from many sides. A loud and general lamentation arose about the increase of all kinds of crimes in the country: murder, suicide, lynching, fraud, gambling frenzy, fornication, shamelessness, etc. And the ultimate cause of these conditions was believed to be found in the religionless state school. The state school was not doing what was reasonably (?) expected of it in view of the enormous sums which had been expended on it. "The results of our national system of education have so far failed to live up to the hopes and expectations of its founders. Popular education is a failure!" So said President Eliot of Harvard. And with this he had only given a point to the thoughts which many before him had expressed. From all sides the subject was taken up: without religion there was no morality, or as President Schurman of Cornell expressed it, "Without religion morality lacks authority." If the state wanted morality, he said, it must bring religion and the Bible into its schools. Sunday schools, he said, had proved thoroughly inadequate. The Bible in the state schools - that was the only salvation of the state. The state was forced to take this step because of its consideration for itself as well as for the youth. Thus it was argued. That it was not the state that had to bring religion into the country in its schools, but the church; that God would not call the state, but the church, to account for the religious neglect of the youth; and that therefore also the church had no right to throw the blame of the inadequate religious education of the youth on the state, but had to beat its own breast, - of this little or nothing was said. All the louder, however, one demanded of the state that it ignore its religious principle and open its schools to instruction in religion and the Bible.

Resolutions concerning the introduction of the Bible into the public schools were passed at several large meetings during the past year. "The International Sunday School Convention decided in Denver: "to appoint a Standing Committee, whose duty it shall be to consider

what means should be taken in the various States and provinces to secure the reading of the Bible, without comment, in the public schools of our land". **The reason given was that the Bible was** "not only the inspired Word of God, but also the world's greatest treasury of literature". A similar resolution was adopted by the National Reform Association in St. Louis. 1) The National Educational Association, composed of thousands of public school teachers, declared at Minneapolis for the literary use of the Bible in the state schools "as a literary work of the highest and purest type, side by side with the poetry and prose which it has inspired and in large part formed." The Iowa State Teachers' Association adopted a resolution that in the state schools "greater attention should be given to moral education" and that the Bible "should always be the teacher's aid and the incomparable means of forming true citizenship as well as literary style". "The Summer School of the South adopted the following resolution in Knoxville in July of last year: "Conscious

1) In Lincoln, Neb., at the instigation of the National Reform Association, a meeting of citizens from all parts of the state was held in March to work for the state to make its schools religious schools, and as such to recognize "the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations, and the supremacy of His moral laws. As purposes which Christian citizens must not lose sight of, the following were named in the appeal: "1. The Christian reformation of our marriage and divorce laws. 2. Positive moral and Christian training in the schools, in preparation for the duties of citizenship. 3. general observance of the Lord's Day, and the abandonment of customs and institutions which violate it. 4. a definite governmental policy looking to the restraint of intemperance and the ultimate suppression of the saloon. 5. due Christian acknowledgements in State Constitutions and in our National Constitution, that the Christian character of the Nation may be declared in our funtamental law. 6. that our action towards our island dependencies, whose whole civic life, including their systems of jurisprudence and education, we arie shaping anew, shall be prompted by Christian and philanthropic considerations, and not in deference to sectarian interests or to the spirit of commercial greed. 7. that all good laws already on our statute books shall be strictly enforced, and all existing Christian features of our government shall be carefully maintained. - All these measures can be accomplished. In God's world and under the government of Christ no evil has 'come to stay'. Christ Himself is our leader, and His interests and glory are involved. The Holy Spirit surrounds us with an atmosphere of love and power, and that power is soon to be exerted "upon all flesh. Let us remember that whenever the Christian people of this country have stood together for any righteous cause they have won their battle. In this spirit of hope let us labor for the reformation and salvation of the country whose salvation means so much to ourselves, to our children, and to the world."

of our dependence upon the God of our fathers, and believing that the highest and truest civilization can be attained only by following the precepts of the great teacher, Jesus Christ, we favor the recognition of the Bible in our public schools." The Junior Order of American Mechanics, which numbers about 200,000, was praised by the Sunday School Times of October 4 for adhering to the following principle: "We hold that the Bible should be read in our public schools, not for sectarianism, but for teaching the truths of the Bible. It is the accepted norm of all moral and civil laws. We believe, therefore, that our children should be educated in the teachings of it." In the State of Missouri (the same thing will probably have been done in other States) this Order petitioned the Board of Education to introduce the Holy Scriptures as a "textbook" in the State schools. At the same time all pastors were asked to preach on February 22 on "The Holy Bible in our Public Schools," and the superintendents of Sunday schools and presidents of youth clubs were requested to make propaganda for the cause. And the Chairman of the Board of Education sent out a request to the preachers of St. Louis to collect signatures for the petition of the Junior Order, on the ground that "The Holy Bible develops the higher principles in men, and makes them more moral, more honorable and honest, and in every way better citizens."

The resolutions themselves bear witness to the fact that the talk of style and literature is only a pretext for introducing the religion of the Bible into the public schools. Referring to the Minneapolis resolution, the Independent, in its October 16 issue, writes: "Is it really literature and not religion that these gentlemen want? We think not. It is not the literary charm, not the interesting stories, not the grandeur and spirit of the Bible, that floats before their eyes, but the holiness of the Bible, their religion. Not a word is said about reading the 'Iliad,' or 'Paradise Lost,' or Shakespeare, until we get into the higher schools, where literature is a special study. But we do not value the Bible first as literature. It is a degradation of the Bible to use it for exercises in style and history. It is not the beautiful, but the holy Scripture. It may be called literature, but in fact it will be treated as a religious book, and this will be the real reason why it is cited and taught. We do not want to introduce the Bible into the public schools under a false pretense. It is the one, great book of our religion, and as such may it be treated, as the church's holy book." And referring to the Knoxville decision, the same paper writes: "The Bible, they

tell us, is the best and choicest of literature, and that it will never do to let the children grow up ignorant of it; and before they have the word literature well out of their mouths they begin to talk about the importance of the Bible to teach the elements of religion and morals." From the Methodist side, too, the thought was expressed that in Minneapolis the resolutions had been so weakly and tamely formulated because otherwise there was no prospect of general acceptance. In other words, the situation at the present time was such that religion could only enter the public schools under the flag of "literature.

Of course, the above resolutions on the introduction of religion and the Bible into the state schools have been greatly applauded by the sectarian press. From the sheer countless debates we will pick out a few. The "Deutfch-American Journal of Theology and the Church," published by the faculty of the Nast Theological Seminary at Berea, Ohio, writes: "As soon as there is talk of introducing the Bible into the elementary school, the Jew, the Catholic, the agnostic, the unbeliever protests, and the Bible must go. It is gratifying and hopeful, however, that in almost every prominent teachers' convention the question is thoroughly discussed, and the great majority of our elementary school teachers decisively and enthusiastically speak the word of the Bible." From this it is sufficiently evident how the Methodists stand on the question. The "Congregationalist" (Feb. 7) is no less explicit, believing that he can do quite well with reason in theology and church, but not without the Bible in the state: "It is illogical and unreasonable to exclude the use of the Hebrew and primitive Christian literature from public education. A nation stultifies itself which forbids its children, when under its instruction, to look into the sources from which its principles of government, its laws, and its standards of conduct are confessedly derived." And with the Methodists and Congregationalists the Presbyterians are of one mind. Our country is ripe for the proposed change in the State schools, says the "Presbyterian." It wrote on August 6: "Hitherto there has been little thought of introducing the Bible into the State schools. At present, however, all signs point to a reaction. There are now many who want to introduce the Bible into the state schools because of its literary value; others because it is God's book and revelation; still others because it is the best book of morals in the world. If these three directions were combined, the Bible would soon be where it should be for the good of the coming generation and of the Republic.

The extent to which the agitation for the introduction of the Bible into the State schools has already been successful is evident from a pamphlet by Dr. Wylie, the secretary of the "National Reform Association."

in which he points out the following facts: There are nine states in which Bible reading is permitted by state constitution or school legislation; twelve states in which the courts and state school superintendents have declared in favor of Bible reading; sixteen states and territories in which there are no laws and decisions in favor of Bible reading, but in which Bible reading has been the custom for many years and has won public opinion; three States and Territories in which the Bible is not read, although there are no laws about it; and five States and Territories in which Bible reading is forbidden by courts or school superintendents. - As to New York in particular, State Superintendent Skinner called the attention of the Legislature to the fact that in the city of New York the reading of passages from the Bible was permitted without any opposition, while in most other parts of the State the reading of the Bible was entirely abstained from. At the same time he declared that he would not forbid the reading of the Bible, as had been done by his predecessor, as long as sectarian explanations were abstained from. 1) In the charter of the city of New York there is also the following passage: "All schools under the jurisdiction of the school board shall be opened with the reading of Bible passages without any addition or explanation." In Kansas and Nebraska, the Bible reading in the public schools was approved by the courts last year. In Nebraska, the Supreme Court first ruled against praying, singing religious songs, and Bible reading as "sectarian," but then modified its ruling to allow Bible reading. The February 7 Congregationalist notes: "This position will ultimately be adopted, we believe, as general public-school policy.

Of non-Lutheran ecclesiastical publications, only one journal has come to our attention which vigorously adheres to the consistent implementation of the separation of church and state and therefore does not want to know anything about religious instruction in the state schools. This is the otherwise

1) The same Dr. Skinner some weeks ago answered in the affirmative the question of the "Catholic Truth Society": whether a Catholic teacher may read from the papist Bible in the state schools. The Independent of 12 March rightly comments: "This illustrates the blundering policy of those strict Protestant religionists who insist that the Bible be read in the schools as a daily religious service. It can breed nothing but quarrels.... In an institution for all the people, like the public schools, there is no right or justice in imposing the religion of one fraction of the people, no matter how large, on the other fraction. The true rule is: No religion of any sort in the public schools. To say that reading the Bible or repeating the Lord's Prayer is not a religious service, is to say what is not true. Give over the care of religion to the Church."

fanatical and incredulous "Independent" of New York. Referring to the first decision of the Nebraska Supreme Court, for example, it writes in its number of October 16: "It neither surprised nor grieved us. The decision pleases us; we think it a good law, and in the interest of justice as well as religion. We think, as our readers know, that it is inequitable and unwise for any kind of religion to be selected and inculcated in public schools maintained by Christians, Jews, and infidels, people of every faith and of none. We believe that it is the business of the church, and not of the state, to teach religion. And it is humiliating and disgraceful when the church must confess that it is unable to do so, and turns to the state with the request that its inadequate ministry be supplemented by its motley crew of teachers. ... We know of a large number of public schools in our cities where the great majority of the pupils are Jews, and yet they have been required to sing Christmas carols, purely Christian songs, in December, to the indignation of their parents. This makes people enemies of the public school system." Ibid: "There is a curse upon State religion. It makes men hate the Church. That is the persistent trouble in Italy, in Spain, in France, and now in England. Give us a free Church in a free State and let their scope be kept absolutely distinct. Trust no State to teach your children religion, and do not think to impose your New Testament Bible and your Lord's Prayer on Old Testament Jews."

It is therefore not pessimism if we are seriously concerned about the greatest good in American freedom, the consequent separation of church and state with its religious freedom and equality of all religions and denominations. The number of pseudo-Americans who neither know nor want the essence of Americanism is threatening to get out of hand. To them, Eliot's word: "Public education is a failure" is just another way of saying: "Americanism is a failure." Yes, this is the thought which underlies the whole agitation for the introduction of religion into the State schools. Should it come to the introduction of the Christian religion (or what is claimed to be it) into the State schools, it is at the same time declared before all the world, "Americanism is a failure. In America we have tried the complete separation of church and state, but experience has taught us that this was a mistake, and we are now returning to the European principle of the coupling of church and state with its state religion and the negation of religious freedom and equality .

(Conclusion follows.)

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Unification Efforts. The Augustana Journal reports that the General Synod has transferred a mission post in McCallsburg, Iowa, to the United Norwegian Synod, and attaches to it the remark: "If union is ever to be brought about, it must be ushered in by a union of the different branches of the same denomination. To this we would remark: It is certainly to be deplored, and has a peculiarly confusing effect on the inexperienced, that even those who bear the Lutheran name fight each other. But all friends of true unity should be careful that the good name of the Lutheran Church is not misused to cover disagreement in Christian doctrine. We Lutherans are bound in conscience to fight papists and sects because they teach contrary to Scripture. This struggle would become hypocrisy and be characterized as partisanship if we were to regard as absent in those who bear the Lutheran name obvious deviations from the doctrine of Scripture. Lutherans are always intent on unity. They offer a hand to negotiate even when, following Luther's example, circumstances offer little prospect of outward success. But Lutherans must never forget that God's Word, and nothing else, can and should make unity. The platform on which all Christians, including Lutherans, are to stand has long been ready. God has given it to His Church in His Word. Efforts to unite, if they are of the right kind, can only ever have the purpose of placing dissenters on the divine platform. The Formula of Concord has at the end of Article XI (Sol. Decl. XI, § 94-96. Müller, p. 724 f.) a concluding remark which clearly expresses the Scriptural principles by which all efforts at union must be governed. It says: "And so much of the conflicting articles, which have been disputed among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession for many years, in which some have erred, and about which grave controversiae, that is, religious disputes, have arisen. From which our declaration, friend and foe, and therefore manly, it is clear that we do not intend, for the sake of temporal peace, tranquility, and unity, to surrender anything to the eternal, unchangeable truth of God (as it is not in our power to do so), which peace and unity, since they are meant against the truth and for the suppression of it, would also have no permanence; much less are we minded to adorn and cover up falsifications of the pure doctrine and public damned errors. But rather to bear a hearty desire and love for such unity, and to promote the same of our part to the utmost of our ability, heartily inclined and eager, by which God may keep his honor unharmed, the divine truth of the holy gospel not deprived of anything, the least error not conceded, the poor sinners brought to true right repentance, established by faith, strengthened in new obedience, and thus alone through the one merit of Christ justified and eternally saved." What a love of unity and truth at the same time is expressed in these words! Would to God that such efforts to establish unity in the Church would become general here in America and throughout the world! F. P.

Working through the medium of the English language does not seem to have been entirely without friction in the Augustana Synod area. This we gather from the following remarks of the "Augustana Journal": "Those who use the

English language should not needlessly thrust themselves into Swedish, Norwegian, or German settlements with the declaration that they understand the situation better than do those that are in charge of the work. There are plenty of fields for the out-and-out English work in other communities than those in the hands of the foreign speaking Lutherans. We are satisfied that the different Scandinavian and German bodies are fully able to take care of their own people who live in old and well-established communities. Let the English Lutherans go to places where the Lutheran Church has no representative. There are hundreds of places of this kind. By so doing there will be no unnecessary friction produced. This does not imply, however, that the English Lutheran Church should be disbarred from going into the larger cities and prosecuting the work there with all possible vigor. But they should remain away from smaller towns and farming communities entirely in the hands of the Scandinavian or German Lutherans." That is easily said. But where are the "English Lutherans" to get the Lutherans with whom they can form congregations from the very beginning, if they do not get these Lutherans from the Scandinavian and German congregations? Certainly, God's Word, preached in English, creates Lutheran congregations. But it is slow. We must not forget that our English-speaking population has grown up in the public schools, where, for the most part, some meager bits of morality are passed off for Christianity. To convert the people to Christianity is hard, very hard work. Therefore it would be cruel, and not to be desired in the interest of the cause, if the English Lutherans were to be banished from the outset from the fields in which old, well-established Lutheran congregations of German and Scandinavian tongue are to be found. Here, too, there may be a strong need to form English congregations, first of all from those who have hitherto been associated with German and Scandinavian congregations. But certain conditions must be present if we are to welcome English congregations to hitherto German or Scandinavian lands. Such churches must, above all things, be in agreement with us in Bible doctrine and practice. They become a curse to the church area in question if they want to play the "liberal" in doctrine and practice. Also, the pure Christian doctrine, as revealed in Scripture and known in the Lutheran Confession, must remain in the foreground with them, as the Apostle Paul demands when he writes: "I did not consider myself to know anything among you except JEsum Christ crucified," 1 Cor. 2:2. They must not, as is the fashion with the English sects, present "the development of moral character" as the goal of the Christian religion. They must not take a "liberal" stand on the "church fellowship question" and the "lodge question. Otherwise they will become a source of irritation in the region, because in this case they confuse the consciences and do not confess the Christian truth, but deny it. They also cause trouble if they do not provide for the Christian education of the children. It is basically a contradiction in terms when Lutheran Christians unite on the basis of the gospel of Christ, but then want to let their children grow up in schools that are devoid of religion and mostly actually hostile to Christ. We therefore do not welcome any English congregation in our midst that does not at least seriously strive to establish a Christian school for the youth. Otherwise an external church system will be set up which is neglected in its foundations and - also according to earlier experiences - forms a transition to the unionist sects. Finally

the demand is no more than reasonable that English congregations should have a decent and orderly beginning among us. Never should discord in German and Scandinavian churches be used to start English churches. If there are disagreements, they should first be settled in a Christian way. Then form English congregations if the need for them exists. F. P.

Augustana Synod. The Swedish state church directs the Swedish emigrants to the local Augustana Synod. The "Augustana Journal" hopes that this will benefit the work of the Augustana Synod. But it says: "Our progress depends on how we ourselves take up the field that is assigned to us." F. P.

What is conversion? The Lutheran Observer answers this question thus: "What it is is definite and clear-a turning from sin and the practice of it, to Christ and righteousness in love. Its method and experiences are as varied as are the men and women who experience it. One man can tell the day and hour of its occurrence, and every circumstance connected with it.... With another the change has been so gradual that it would be impossible to- tell when or how it happened, but the fact is very real... . . One thing after another appeared to be wrong, one thing after another impressed itself as duty, until at last, without any peculiar experience of transition, the love of Christ filled his heart, and he came to know himself a Christian. *That i" conversion, no matter how it comes - loving Christ and striving to serve Him.*" -

The fruits of conversion the "Observer" here gives out for the essence of it. The General Synod is not firm in the Abc of Christendom. F. B.

Of Confirmation, the Methodist "Apologist" of April **8 writes**: "Confirmation, in the usual sense of the word, is not known in the Methodist Church. It requires the preacher to give the children thorough religious instruction, and if he wishes to make the examination a public examination before the congregation, he has the right to do so, and such a celebration can be a great blessing for young and old. We doubt, however, whether it is advisable to call this act Confirmation, for it is not, nor should it be; therefore the expression is misleading, and at the same time there is a danger that many will believe that the Methodist Church now also resorts to Confirmation. Confirmation, as it is practiced today, is by no means a blessing to the Protestant Church." - In the Lutheran Church, confirmation is essentially an examination, a public examination, in order to demonstrate before the entire congregation that those who were baptized in childhood have received the necessary instruction which the Church owes them, and that they have been promoted in Christian knowledge to such an extent that they can examine themselves and thus be admitted to Holy Communion. If the Methodists have also adopted this part with the Confirmation instruction, they have in fact introduced the Lutheran Confirmation. - The revival methods no longer seem to work with the Methodists, Baptists, and other sects, and the Sunday schools are not doing what they expected them to do. So they are trying the institute of Confirmation classes. The Baptist "Messenger," April 15, writes: "Shall we not have a substitute for Confirmation classes? This question is not new. Again and again it crops up in our midst; and though we have passed it by shaking our heads, it has always come in our way. It is an important question, for two important things are at stake here: first, the spiritual welfare and prosperity of our children, and second, the welfare and success of our

and both are of such importance that we cannot pass them by with a shrug of the shoulders. The fact is that confirmation classes are the best thing that some churches have in the care of souls, and they are the strongest support of their existence. If some churches were to abolish it, they would soon collapse. Even our Methodist brethren have considered this question in detail, and have warmly recommended the teaching of Confirmation, and in many cases have introduced it; they are practical, and see the importance of the matter. Through Confirmation classes the congregations concerned not only receive new members every year, but they exert a deep, lasting and far-reaching influence on them. The preachers have the children under their supervision and influence during the years that are the most important for the child's life. It is in these years that the spiritual life is awakened and they are therefore most receptive to religious impressions. Statistics prove that most conversions occur from the twelfth to the sixteenth year of life. These years are also the dangerous years of a child's life, and it is of infinite importance to them if they then find a strong support and a faithful counselor, whose counsel and influence in their lives become a power." - The institute of Confirmand instruction as such does not do it: it all depends on what is taught and done in the same. F. B.

Rationalism among Methodists, Dr. Holmes, member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has written a pamphlet showing how Methodism is eaten up with unbelief. At Garrett Biblical Institute, the Methodist theological seminary in the West, in fact, stands as professor Dr. M. S. Terry, who is an outspoken rationalist and destructive Bible critic. Now when Dr. Holmes stood up in conference against Terry, and demanded that the matter be investigated by a committee, he was deprived of the floor by the bishop, who presided, and the meeting resolved to lay the whole matter on the table. The Bishop and the majority of the Conferencers evidently agree with Dr. Terry, but for reasons of expediency dare not yet come forward with their disbelief. F. B.

Campbell Morgan, the successor of Moody, said after the "Chriftl. Apologist" before a conference in Grand Rapids: "The characteristic of the present time is: crass indifference to everything divine. People are no longer concerned about their souls. Churches have no particular attraction for the masses. One reads very few religious writings or books outside the church. A thousand and one things are talked about in the shops, in the workshops, but not about religion. In the old days many debates on religious questions were fought out in such places; today they have lost their interest. The old materialism of theory is dead, but the new materialism has arisen. Today people no longer talk about materialism; today they live it. This is the state of things outside the church, and for this state the church itself is to be held responsible. In the Church there is no burning zeal to save souls. The time for it is thought to be past. The deep religious feelings are lost in the church. That is why it can no longer sing as it once did; that is why it no longer weeps tears for lost sinners; that is why it no longer feels the pain that burning love for a fallen world that needs saving produces; that is why the song of rejoicing no longer rushes through the camp. The Church is in danger, but not the religion of our Lord. That will live on... But if, notwithstanding the great blessings of her task, the Church shows herself unworthy of it, God will cast her away, and choose another servant. The task of the Church

is simple, it can be done by her. What must it do? It must make this increasing indifference impossible. It must force the world either to agree with it or to oppose it. Uncertainty and doubt must disappear from the pulpits. The church must again become demonstrative. Her jubilant song and her Hallelujah must again reach the ears of mankind, must seize them. She must bear clear and definite witness to the revealed truths of the Bible. From its preaching it must be heard that man lives in conflict with God, with the world, and with himself; that Christ has come to remove this conflict and to work peace; that he can save and save poor lost sinners." - Campbell Morgan apparently stands higher than most sectarian preachers. For example, several weeks ago he publicly stated: "I cannot and will not enter into any alliance with men whose creed denies the essential elements of salvation." If Campbell Morgan wants to lift up the American church, he must, however, declare war on modern liberalism, which denies Christ's person and work, and bring the pastors to preach repentance and forgiveness of sins through Christ crucified. F. B.

The "Kirchenzeitung" reports about **the Reformed** Church: "We have 1692 congregations, but only 1112 pastors. Of these, 285 serve no congregations; the 1692 congregations are thus served by 827 pastors. On the average, therefore, two congregations would come to one preacher, but in reality they are distributed quite differently. There are three posts with seven churches each, nine posts with six each, eighteen with five each, and sixty-five with four churches each. At least 105 posts have three churches each and no less than 182 posts have two churches each. Only 545 churches have one pastor each. Of the 1112 pastors, 450 preach in the German language, or in both German and English. These 1692 congregations last year numbered 255,408 communicants and 129,864 unconsirmed members, and are distributed among 58 classes and 8 synods."

II. Abroad.

The Catechism in Modern Pedagogy. "The Christian World" writes: "When Luther wrote his catechisms, he could believe that people would learn religion at the same time as they learned the 'main pieces'; for in the words, according to the psychology of the ancients, lay something of the essence of the thing, and therefore, at the same time, with the word which was impressed upon the memory, a kind of germ was laid in the soul, which possessed the power to produce from itself a Christian faith and life. This kind of psychology has been definitely behind us for a century; we see in the word only a sign by which the person addressed is called upon to reproduce an imaginative content that already lies within him and has been formed by experience. The content that a word has for the person addressed depends, therefore, not on the giver, but on the receiver. Strictly speaking, one can only give sounds through language; the sense must be added by the hearer. If the complex of sounds offered to him does not awaken in the student an already acquired idea, he cannot enrich his knowledge in content. The more abstract the concept which a word designates, the larger must be the circle of imagination which the word picture awakens in the hearer, if understanding is really to be achieved. These elementary psychological truths are now the basis of the methodology of all subjects; hence the watchword in all fields: Only through direct experience can the spiritual life be truly enriched. For religious education, too, Schleiermacher and Pestalozzi at the same time, but independently of each other, put forth the principle of-

spoken: Religion cannot be taught by communicating religious creeds or doctrines and systems and having them learned by heart; rather, religion must be experienced and lived; it can only be transmitted from person to person, but not taught. Thus the death knell seemed to have been pronounced for the teaching of religion in schools; for if it can offer nothing but empty words and incomprehensible formulas, it is better that it should cease its work altogether. It is true that it has been thought that the introduction of Bible stories has already remedied the evil, for the stories offer the concrete content of experience for the general religious and moral concepts; but this is in general mere deception. Stories, even if they are vividly imagined by the pupil, are always at first only experiences of external events. They become valuable for the religious inner life only when the pupil is stimulated to his own inner experiences by the imagination of the narrated event. He who has heard and understood the story of the rich young man has had an external experience. If he then feels led to take an inward stand on this story, if he is perhaps indignant at Jesus' insolence, if he approves of the rich young man's conduct, he gains a moral and religious experience, but a false one. If, on the other hand, a presentiment rises in him of the moral greatness of the Saviour, who, just as he is about to lay down his life for his God-given calling, must demand similar sacrifices of his disciples, if he painfully feels the distance that separates him from this greatness of sentiment, but if at the same time he feels attracted by the Master who may demand so great a thing because he gives the power for so great a thing - then the man who feels this way has enriched his inner life by a religious experience. If these experiences are expressed in judgments and condensed into general confessions and maxims, catechisms or systems of the doctrine of faith and morals come into being. These, then, are not a root but a fruit of religious experience; they are, as Schleiermacher ('Reden', first edition, p. 75) expresses it, only the shadows of our religious excitements, and he who does not share these with us has no valuable possession of them. From all this it follows for the methodology of religious instruction that it is of no use to transmit formulas of faith and systems of doctrine to youth, who lack experience above all. The attempt to teach religion to pupils by systematic recitation of the doctrines of faith and morals is a psychological-pedagogical anachronism. As summaries of conclusions for the purpose of easier comprehensibility, system-like confessions are very well admissible. Only, in order to preserve the connection with experience, one will do well if one does not offer these summaries all at once, but rather lets them develop piecemeal in connection with growing experience." - These and similar thoughts, with which modern pedagogues, infected with Schleiermacher's enthusiasm, are wont to combat the teaching of catechism in schools, are based on a gross fallacy. From the fact that a word remains empty to him who hears it, as long as his mind lacks the content which it is to connect with it, the conclusion is drawn that even a sentence or a proposition (a combination of words) is not understood, if the truth of it is not found beforehand in the mind of man. The sentence, God loved the world, is not understood by him who hears it, if the words God, or world, or love, are foreign to him, and if he does not know what ideas he is to connect with these individual words. But it does not follow from this that he understands the truth which is expressed in this sentence only if the same truth had already been expressed in his mind before the sentence was communicated to him.

He understands the thought it communicates. If he understands the individual words of which the **above** judgment is composed, he also understands the thought which it communicates, even if he has hitherto been of the opinion that God hates the world. Through the medium of the word, a wholly new truth, hitherto wholly unknown to him, has been communicated to him from without. It is quite similar with those words and expressions of the Catechism with which a child does not yet associate a definite meaning. If modern pedagogues were consistent, they would theoretically have to admit the thesis: Language is not a medium for the communication of thought, and practically they would have to resign their office as teachers and generally cease all speaking and teaching. That they do not do this, but continue to speak and write, is a proof that they do not understand their own words, or do not believe them. F. B.

In his new brochure "Scientific Ethics and Moral Legislation", Prof. Dr. Otto Ritschl-Bonn argues **that theological science has no obligation to the Church.** Having established the concept of science to the effect that it is concerned only with the acquisition of new knowledge, he rejects further practical purposes of theology. "The advocates of the Church have long felt that what, for instance, theological science does for it is much more a gift of Dana than a service according to their hearts. But either theology really wants to serve the church with its work of knowledge, then it must also be ready to be its handmaiden, as once in the Middle Ages the whole of science was, even in its other branches. But then theology is no longer science. For thinking thrives as science only when it is entirely free. Or theology is in this sense free science, in which case it has no service to the church as its own task, but rather has only to fulfill its merely scientific tasks of knowledge." And in a note he further remarks: "The purely scientific tasks of theological research do not, of course, exclude the possibility that the same persons who are responsible for them may also pursue materially related practical occupations as academic teachers, as teachers in higher schools, or as clergymen, and devote themselves to work of a practical nature." This reminds us, as the "Reformation" remarks, of the words of Prof. Krüger (Gießen) about "unchurch theology," which does not have the purpose of saving souls, but rather of "endangering souls.

F. B.

What was the original Christianity? This question is answered by "Die Christliche Welt", the paper of the Ritschlians: "Christianity is Christ. His person and his act of death solve all mysteries and unfold all religious and moral powers. I no longer live, but God lives in me - that was his life. This gave him the power to overcome the world, sin and death and all the false religions surrounding him. One thing is necessary: follow me. That was feine whole theology, the best there ever was; for light is kindled only by light, life is created only by life, person is fashioned only by person." - Christ has shown us how to do it,-that is summa summarum of Ritschl's theology. F. B.

"**Let each man be blessed in his own way.**" This word of Frederick the Great was recalled by the German Emperor on his visit to Posen. On this the "E. K. Z." remarks: "The Emperor here used the word in its original sense, representing the principle of toleration, not indifference to the confessions; Frederick II. used the word to establish the necessity of confessional schools. On June 22, 1740, State-

Minister von Brand and Consistorial President von Reichenbach wrote to Frederick II that Roman Catholic schools had been established because of the Roman Catholic soldiers' children, especially in Berlin, and that these schools had given rise to all kinds of conventions. They now inquired whether the Roman Catholic schools should remain, or what other answer they should give the Generalfiscal. The King wrote in the margin: 'The religions must all be tolerated, and the Fiscal must have an eye to it that none of the others abuses, for here every man must be happy after his own fashion.'" - It is a strange phenomenon that despisers of the church are as a rule much more easily won over to religious liberty than, for example, the papists and other sects. America, too, is an example of this, both in the past and in the present. The reason for this is not, as with Lutherans, the clear recognition of the difference between church and state, but the natural sense of justice which is paralyzed in papists and reformists by their false doctrine of church and state.

F. B.

The French Government and the Catholic Orders. Last year Combes expelled the congregations which were concerned with the school system. About 2700 schools were closed. The Romans hoped that the people would revolt against the government in favor of the nuns, and the orders and bishops did not lack incitements to do so. But the nuns had to submit. Combes had even greater success in his fight against the preaching orders. On March 24, the Chamber decided to expel these rich and powerful congregations by 304 votes to 246. The monks pointed out their services to France through their missions in the Orient and in Madagascar. But Combes maintained his position: the orders are dangerous to the state, harmful to the common good and obstructive to the regular clergy. They meddle in politics, influence it with their money, fight the Republic, nourish hatred and revolution, mix religion and business, pay little or no taxes, and suck the people dry. On March 26, the Carthusians, who are famous throughout the world for the aroma (not of their piety, but) of their liquors, presented a special petition for authorization, which was signed by more than 100,000 persons. But their request was rejected by 338 votes to 231. The famous monastery of La Grande Chartreuse, founded in 1024 (the present building was begun in 1137), will be closed. The Carthusians want to transfer their business to Austria. Of the expelled orders, 20 have declared that they will only yield to force. But they too will suffer the same fate as the nuns. Combes has already written to the bishops that they must immediately forbid the members of the orders to preach in the churches if they do not want their churches closed. A second letter demands the immediate cessation of all religious activity within the orders that have been denied authorization. - This looks like persecution and is also presented as such, especially by Catholic newspapers. France wants neither the Christian nor any other religion. This is shown by the expulsion of the religious orders. But this does not emerge from the accusation against the orders. What the French government accuses the orders of are quite different things than piety and Christianity, namely: plotting against the Republic and sucking the country dry. It must not be forgotten that the report on the religious orders was submitted by a committee which consisted almost exclusively of Catholics. But how the State can dissolve trusts and labor unions when they serve the good of the

The same is true of orders that are concerned with politics and worldly business. And when Catholics say that it is in the nature of the Catholic religion that it is concerned with politics, they are only admitting that the papacy is a kingdom of this world and therefore by its nature always dangerous to the state. In this sense the incredulous Gambetta was quite right when he declared: "Le clgricalisme, voila I'ennemi." France, of course, makes the fatal mistake of confusing Pabstry with Christianity. But the fact that, according to the official report, 5650 businesses were conducted by the French orders last year, 3845 boarding houses and 1805 businesses of a purely secular nature, testifies to their complete secularization. To the latter belonged, for example: Wholesale and retail trade in alcohol, wine, whisky, beer and medicaments, operation of drinking houses, connected with billiard halls, pig trade, printing houses, pharmacies (238), tailor shops (447), laundries, dye houses, political newspapers with 700,000 readers etc. Of the members of the Order already expelled, about 5000 have settled in Belgium. A not inconsiderable number, however, have their eyes fixed on Canada and the United States. How long will it be before we also have a religious question in American politics? - Archbishop Ireland is reported as having addressed a letter to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, in which he says that the forcible expulsion of the Passionists in particular would be noted with disgust by the people of the United States, and would be regarded as a cruel act of religious persecution, and would do much to destroy the esteem in which our country holds France. - Jreland is acting as if he were the lord and regent of the country and the true representative of the American people. This case shows that the Roman clergy in America are not inferior to the French prelates and orders in insolence, impudence, and imperiousness.
F.B.

Between Combes and Rampolla now also a jnvestiture dispute has broken out. It concerns three bishops to be appointed. Combes claims that according to the Concordat the government appoints the bishops and not the pope. Rampolla claims that the French government only names to the pope the persons whom the pope then appoints and elevates to bishops. According to the Concordat, Combes is evidently right, for in the same it says of the government: nominavit episcopum. In his bull of appointment, however, the pope used to insert a nobis and write: nobis nominavit. The words of the Concordat, "She has appointed," have thus been changed by the pope into the words, "She has named us." But with this the right of appointment of the government is degraded to a mere right of proposal. Already under Napoleon III, then again under Thiers and Ferry, there were violent clashes because of this falsification of the Concordat, without a principal decision of the dispute having taken place. Combes now insists on the right of the government and the wording of the Concordat, and wants to grant the pope only the canonical appointment, which is to be sought by the person appointed by the government. In order to make the pope more docile, the question was raised in the French Chamber: whether it was not time to repeal the Concordat. Combes declared: he did not wish to say that the day of the repeal of the Concordat was not near, but it had not yet come. The government would maintain the Concordat on condition that the clergy remained out of politics. Thus the pope finds himself in a dilemma: If he does not yield, it may cost him the denationalization of the Church in France. If he gives in, then he lets go with it the dogma of the episcopus universalis, "a quo debeant petere ordinatio-
.

nem et confirmationem omnes episcopi et pastores per totum orbem terrarum, qui habeat jus eligendi, ordinandi, confirmandi, deponendi omnes episcopos". (Symb. Books, Müller, p. 328.)

F. B.

The French priest Auzanne, who converted to the Protestant Church, says in his letter of resignation to the Bishop of Soisfons, among other things: "You place yourselves between man and the Godhead in order to exploit the former and ridicule the latter. Your theology is contrary to the Gospel; your morality is a hypocrisy, your worship a comedy. In a word, you have but one dogma, a dogma which is all the rest: three domination of civil society by the clergy, the confiscation of all the goods of this earth by the Church, which promises to the deprived a substitute for them in heaven. You cry out that you are being persecuted because you are no longer permitted to burn those who do not submit to your rule. You also cry: "Long live liberty!" And yet you have devised the Syllabus which condemns all liberties. I find nothing but lies among you: nothing but hypocrisy in the houses of worship, exploitation in the sacristies, greed and fornication in the monasteries. For these reasons, following the voice of my conscience, I have decided to resign my office as priest." The fundamental error of the Roman Church, the doctrine of works righteousness, remains unstung even in this letter. F. B.

Submitted Literature.

Hanewinckel, F., separirt ev.-luth. pastor at Dresden, "Is the Bible God's Word?" A lecture. Zwickau i. S. Verlag des Schriftenvereins der sep. ev.luth. Gemeinden in Sachsen. 14 S. 8°. Price: 20 Pf. (First, in regard to the New Testament, three questions are answered in the affirmative: 1. Are the books of the New Testament genuine? 2. Are the authors of them legitimate as messengers of God? (3) Did God speak through them? It is then demonstrated that the New Testament consistently declares the Old Testament to be the Word of God. In the introduction it is aptly pointed out that the question: Is the Bible the Word of God? is the principium cognoscendi for the whole Christian doctrine).

Kinzler, Ad., theol. teacher at the Ev. Missionsanstalt in Basel. "Classical Periwinkle." 284 Latin citations according to meaning and application. Stuttgart 1899. published by D. Gundert. Price: about 75 cents. (This little book is intended first of all for those who have no classical education themselves, but who wish to orient themselves about the origin and sense of frequently occurring Latin dicta. The classically educated will also like to take it in hand from time to time. We list a few of the sayings treated: Ab ovo - Abusus non tollit usum - Caesar non supra grammaticos - Calumniare audacter, semper aliquid haeret - Coelum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt - Compelle intrare - Concordia discors - Cui bono - Cum grano salis - Experto crede Ruperto- Summum jus, summa injuria etc.).

Toepel, Adolf, Lutheran Pastor. "Polemics in Confirmation Classes." A Hülssbüchlein sür vielbeschäftigte Pastoren. Milwaukee, Wis.' Northwestern Publishing House. 1903. 31 p. cl. 8°. (Highly recommended. Takes into consideration the Catechism of the Wisconsin and Missouri Synods. The reference books from which it refers for further information should be found in the hands of all pastors. The price is not given us, but will be about 15 cents).

Ulhorn, Friedrich. "Gerhard Ulhorn, Abbot of Loccum." A biography. Stuttgart. 1903. published by D. Gundert. 322 p.gr. 8°. Price: about $2.00. (Very interesting, but the reader must have practiced senses if he is not to be misled).

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 49. **May 1903.** **No. 5.**

The reports on the conference in Watertown.

The undersigned regrets that he must publicly oppose a report in the "Lutheran" concerning the Watertown Conference. But the report is so misleading, and so calculated to make impossible what the free Conferences aim at, that a public correction becomes a duty. The conference itself, in response to a suggestion from the Ohio side, expressed the wish that the published reports should not speak of a victory for one side or the other, but should be limited (of course, after stating the external data and the subjects discussed) to the fact that serious efforts had been made to negotiate objectively, and that further negotiations were not considered hopeless. But the reporter in the "Lutheran" (General Council) did not heed this wish of the Conference. In a fine number of May 14, he brings a detailed report, the sum of which is this: 1. an agreement has been reached, 2. this "happy result" has been achieved by the undersigned modifying the position of the Missouri Synod, or Synodal Conference, and promising the correction of certain sentences that were offensive to the opposing side.

Both the first and the second part of the report are in direct contradiction with the facts. There has not been the slightest factual rapprochement between "Missouri" and "Ohio" - to use these short terms - in Watertown, as far as the public debates are concerned. The factual situation is also such that a rapprochement is impossible at all. It is a question of either/or. It is a question of whether that which is decisive in every actual conversion and in every actual continuance in the faith lies in the grace of God or in man. Between these opposites there is no mediation, and here there was also no mediation in Watertown, since both sides firmly held their position. The Ohio side held decidedly that man could of his own power leave off what is called the Muthwillige Widerstreben, which prevents conversion, but added that this could not be regarded as a

The other side held just as firmly that the omission of even willful resistance was only due to God's grace. The other side held just as firmly that the refraining from even willful resistance was only due to the grace of God, because the natural man, as God's enemy, resists the converting grace of God so long and in all kinds of ways, even knowingly and willingly, until he is renewed by the Holy Spirit. By what means the reporter in the "Lutheran" got the impression that an agreement had been reached, we can only suppose. He does not enter at all into the subject under discussion. Thus he has lost sight of the real point of difference and the debates on it. Questions raised in passing thrust themselves into his mind. He says, among other things: "Just before the close on Thursday afternoon, Dr. Allwardt acknowledged that he fully agreed with President Pieper." Or. Allwardt's agreement did not refer to the doctrinal position I held, but to a statement I made in reference to an alleged quotation from "Doctrine and Defense." The context, to my recollection, was this: the debate was already closed, but Or. Allwardt still had the floor. Dr. Allwardt claimed that in "Lehre und Wehre" it was stated that a part of the people should not be saved. He mentioned volume and page number. They did not think to close with this, but to listen to another explanation from me. I then explained that if this was so plainly stated in "Lehre und Wehre," as Father Allwardt had said, then I would see to it that it was immediately revoked. My supposition, however, is that the passage in question speaks of the voluntas Dei consequens. 1) I explained, on the basis of John 3:17, 18, that, according to Scripture, a distinction must be made between voluntas Dei antecedens and consequens. God's will was first to save the whole world: "God sent not his Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world through him might be saved." But if men rejected this will of God's grace in unbelief, God's will was that these people should not be saved, but condemned: "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he believeth not on the name of the only begotten Son of God." To this exposition Or. Allwardt indicated his full assent. There was, therefore, no question of agreement with the doctrinal position of the Synodal Conference, which was expressed in my discourse. We would deceive ourselves and others if we were to suppose that a factual agreement had been reached at Watertown.

Likewise, to suppose that I "modified" the doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod at Watertown would be to commit a deception as to the whole state of affairs. I did not modify anything at Watertown.

1) This is indeed the case in the passage in question. "L. u. W., 1878, p. 352 (Words of J. A. Osiander).

I have not fictionalized or concealed anything, but have unabashedly brought our position, as I have represented it for 25 years, into the light. Whoever agrees with my lecture and the verbal debates, which also came from other quarters, does not agree with a "modified" but with the original doctrinal position of the Synodal Conference. Admittedly, in the report of the "Lutheran" a number of statements are attributed to me which would imply a modification of our former doctrinal position. But I did not make these statements. How the reporter could attribute them to me, I do not understand. I can only excuse him by saying that it is difficult to give a correct account of a doctrinal debate when one is oneself remote from the matter. I point out the following: It is true that I have very decidedly rejected absolute election in the Calvinistic sense, because according to Scripture eternal election both presupposes Christ's merit (έν Χριστώ, Eph. 1, 4.), and includes in itself the whole way of salvation (ε'ίλατο ύμ. ας ύ ΰ-εος απ' άρχης εις σωτηρίαν έν άγιασμ. ώ πνεύματος χαί πίστει αλητείας, 2 Thess. 2, 13.). But I have not rejected "an election to the faith," as the account ascribes to me. I have rather, as regards the relation of eternal election to the temporal state of grace of the elect, set forth at some length that not only an eternal election to faith, but also to calling, justification, sanctification, preservation, etc., is to be taught. I stated the principal passages dealing with eternal election, and pointed out that the children of God should trace all the spiritual blessings bestowed upon them in time to their eternal election as a cause of the same. Further, I have said that anyone who asks, "Am I an elect?" must always be referred to Christ, the means of grace, and the way of salvation. The eternal election, he said, was never to be considered "mere" (nude), because from eternity it was not "mere," but έν άγιασμώ πνεύματος xai πίστει αλητείας. But I have not called the sentence false, "Because I am chosen, I shall be saved." Christians, indeed, are to take comfort in the election discerned from the Gospel, as the Apostle Paul states Rom. 8, 28-39. and the Lutheran Confession repeats and emphatically inculcates, "There is also this doctrine the beautiful glorious consolation, that ... He (God) has so well and certainly willed to keep my blessedness, because it could easily be lost from our hands through the weakness and wickedness of our flesh, or torn and taken from us through the cunning and violence of the devil and the world, that He has decreed the same in His eternal purpose, which cannot be filed or overturned, and has placed it in the almighty hand of our Saviour JEsu Christ, from which no one can tear us, John 10. 10, wherefore also Paul saith Rom. 8, "Because we are called according to the principle, who then will separate us from the love of God in Christ? "1) Further, I

1) Müller, p. 714.

I have admitted that the theory of election "in respect of faith" does not necessarily imply synergism, namely, if one holds that the origin of faith in solidum is an effect of the Holy Spirit. But I added that the intuitu fidei is not found in Scripture, and that the doctrine thus determined is not the Scriptural doctrine of the election of grace, but a mere thing of thought. Not did I add that the intuitu fidei "may be tolerated rightly understood." According to the context of the trial, there was no question of toleration of infirmities-that is a chapter by itself-but there was a question of what Scripture's doctrine of election by grace was. The undersigned and others argued that clear statements of Scripture were not to be reinterpreted in the alleged interest of analogia fidei.

Nor did I "regret" at Watertown that such expressions as "persistent reluctance" had been used on our side. The expression "persevering" reluctance is Scriptural (axx τω πνεόματι τω άγίω άντίπίπτετε, Apost. 7:51.), and will be used by us, as heretofore, so in the future. A statement which was always repeated at Watertown by members of the Synodical Conference was this, "There is, according to Scripture, a persistent, wanton, etc. Resistance to the converting grace of God, whereby conversion and blessedness are hindered. But that in those who are converted and blessed there has not been the reluctance which prevents conversion, this is not to be ascribed to better conduct on their part, but to the grace of God alone."

Now a few words about "misunderstood expressions" in earlier Missouri publicity. There has been quite a lot of talk of this in Watertown, at the request of the opposing side. Most of what they use to quote against us is taken out of context. The context provides all the necessary clarification. There remain a few passages in which we have spoken more or less ambiguously. As is well known, already at the beginning of the election controversy ("Lehre und Wehre", 1881, p. 43 ff.), the same Dr. Walther spoke out in a special article "about all those passages in our synodal reports and in our synodal organs, in regard to which we ourselves want the Augustinian 'Sententiam teneat, linguam corrigat' to be applied to us. We can now understand that our opponents, from their point of view, like to cite such expressions. But, on the other hand, they must not take it amiss with us if we prove to them again and again that they (our opponents) have not been and are not offended by some misleading expressions, but rather by divine truth from the very beginning. This is absolutely necessary in the interest of the matter and of true unity, when the negotiations turn to the "citations.

Recent Pentateuch Criticism.

(Continued.)

I.

(2) The testimony of the other books of the Old Testament.

On the basis of the self-testimony of the Pentateuch, the Israelite church unanimously held the Book of Five to be the work of Moses, and immediately after the conclusion of the Pentateuch, Deut. 31:9, 24 ff, it was established as a definite quantity among the people of Israel, was known and spread among them, and was recognized without contradiction as the writing of Moses. This is proved by the testimony of the other Old Testament books, which often either speak expressly of the written Pentateuch under the names "the book of the law," "the law of Moses," "the book of the law of Moses," "the book of the covenant," "the law of God," "the law of the Lord," or else presuppose it as existing and known. It would lead too far to consider all the passages; let us hear only the most important, first from the historical books, from Joshua's days to the post-exilic period. To Joshua the Lord says at the beginning of the book of Joshua: "Be of good cheer, and be very glad that thou keepest and doest all things according to the law which Moses my servant commanded thee. . . . And let not the book of this law depart out of thy mouth, but consider it day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein," Jos. 1:7, 8. In the middle of the book it is said: "Then Joshua built an altar unto the LORD God of Israel in mount Ebal, as Moses the servant of the LORD commanded the children of Israel, as it is written in the book of the law of Moses, an altar of whole stones hewn with no iron. . and there he wrote upon the stones the other law" (literally: the copy of the law of Moses, XXX XXXX XXXX XX 1), "which Moses had commanded the children of Israel. ... After that he caused to be proclaimed all the words of the law of blessing and cursing, as it is written in the book of the law. There was not a word that Moses commanded that Joshua did not proclaim before all the congregation of Israel", Jos. 8, 30. ff. And at the end of the book we are told that Joshua held a Diet and exhorted the people to do and keep "all that was written in the Book of the Law of Moses," Jos. 23:6, and finally renewed the covenant of the people with God, presented them with laws and rights to secure and "wrote all these things in the Book of the Law of God," Jos. 24:25 ff. These passages clearly state that the Book of the Law of Moses was written, and that Joshua wrote an appendix to it. In the book of Judges such explicit passages are missing, but it can be seen that

1) Cf. April issue of "Lehre und Wehre", p. 103.

(1) And when he saith, that the Lord suffered the heathen nations to remain in Canaan, to try Israel upon them, "that it might be known whether they obeyed the commandments of the Lord, which he commanded their fathers by Moses," Judges 3:4, and that Hebron was given to Caleb "as Moses said," Judges 3:4, and that Hebron was given to Caleb "as Moses said. 3, 4. and that Hebron was given to Caleb, "as Moses had said," Judg. 1, 20.: so an unprejudiced reader will find in them mentions of the Pentateuch, just as the Arabs cite the Koran with very similar formulas, without expressly attaching the word "book". (Cf. from the New Testament such passages as, "Moses commanded," "Moses permitted," "Isaiah crieth," "David saith," Match. 19, 7. f. Rom. 9, 27. 11, 9.) From the story of the marriage of Ruth, which is told in the book of Ruth, it appears that the so-called levirate law commanded in the fifth book of Moses (Cap. 25, 5. ff.), that one should marry the widow of his brother in order to raise up a name for the deceased, was known among the people, Ruth 3, 12. 4, 1. ff. When, according to the account of the books of Samuel, Israel desired a king, and the Lord chose Saul for it, Samuel "told the people all the rights of the kingdom, and wrote them in a book, and laid it before the Lord," 1 Sam. 10, 25. The whole account of the king's election clearly recalls the king's law, Deut. 17, 14. et seq, and the act of Samuel in writing the rights of the kingdom in a book and laying it before the Lord is a factual confirmation of the keeping of the book of the law by the ark of the covenant, Deut. 31, 24 ff, to which Hengstenberg aptly calls attention when he says: "Samuel - to which the author points - took as his model the example of Moses, who had formerly done the same thing for the same purpose. Had not the law of the Lord already lain before the ark of the covenant, Samuel would scarcely have thought of laying down this essay there." Moreover, in the books of Samuel there are so many references and allusions to the law and quotations from it, that this fully compensates for the absence of explicit statements about its written fixation, and that by Moses. 3)

Such direct statements, however, are found again in numerous numbers in the books of Kings. Before his departure David admonishes his son Solomon: "Wait on the guard of the LORD your God, that you may walk

1) This evidence is given in detail by Hävernick-Keil, "Spezielle Einleitung in den Pentateuch." Second edition, p. 496; Keil, "Lehrbuch der historischkritischen Einleitung in die Schriften des Alten Testaments." Third edition, p. 165; Hengstenberg, "Die Authentie des Pentateuchs," II- p. 27; Rupprecht, "Des Rätsels Lösung," II- 1, p. 368, and: "Wissenschaftliches Handbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament," p. 53; French, "Lex Mosaica or the Law of Moses and the Higher Criticism"- p. 125.

2) "The Authenticity of the Pentateuch," II- p. 252.

3) Detailed evidence in the aforementioned apologetic works.

in his ways, and keep his customs, commandments, statutes, testimonies, as it is written in the law of Moses," 1 Kings 2:3. It is reported of Jehu, "that he walked not in the law of the LORD God of Israel with all his heart," 2 Kings 10:31. To the young king Jehoash, at his coronation, Jehoiada the priest delivers the testimony, 2 Kings 11:12, which was nothing else than the book of the law, or a copy of it, and which was delivered according to the precept of Deut. 17:18 f. Of king Amaziah it is said in 2 Kings 14:6, that he slew not the children of his father's murderers; "as it is written in the book of the law of Moses, where the Lord commanded, saying, The fathers shall not die for the children's sakes, neither shall the children die for the fathers' sakes:" wherewith Deut. 24:16 is literally quoted. Hezekiah, the king of Judah, is praised as having "adhered to the Lord, and departed not backward from him, and kept his commandments, which the Lord commanded Moses," 2 Kings 18:6.While at the same time it is reported of the inhabitants of the kingdom of Israel, that they were carried away by the king of Assyria, because they "had not hearkened unto the voice of the LORD their God, and had transgressed his covenant, and all that Moses the servant of the LORD had commanded; neither had they hearkened unto any of them, nor done them," v. 11. f. So the members of the ten-tribe kingdom must have possessed the law of the Lord in written form, as at the close of the seventeenth chapter it is expressly spoken of the "customs, laws, statutes, and commandments, which he (Jehovah) hath commanded you," v. 37, in the well-known book of the law of Moses. To this is referred again, when it is said of the time of Manasseh, that the members of the kingdom of Judah did not obey, and did not do according to "all that I (Jehovah) commanded, and according to all the law which Moses my servant commanded them," 2 Kings 21:8. And when once in these sad times the law became almost unknown, and the book of the covenant, which was kept in the temple, according to Mosiah's instruction, 5 Mos. 31:24 ff, had fallen into oblivion, then one day the high priest Hilkiah found it again and said to the scribe Shaphan: "I have found the Book of the Law in the house of the Lord." 1) Hilkiah then gave the book

1) Against the objection of the critics that it is inconceivable that a law known to the people could so soon fall into oblivion, that therefore the Pentateuch had not existed before, W. H. Green has pointed out a strange example from world history. He reports: "My friend, Professor Zenos, of McCormick Theological Seminary, has directed my attention to the following signal instance in modern times of the total oblivion of a noted code of laws previously in force. It is thus described by Sir J. Stephen in his 'Lectures on the History of France,' Lecture IV, p. 94: 'When the barbarism of the domestic government (under the Carlovingian dynasty) had thus succeeded the barbarism of the government of the state, one of the most remarkable results of that political change was the disappearance of the laws

And he brought it unto Josiah the king, and read it before him: whereupon the king made a great reformation after it. He gathered all the people together in the temple, and "they read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant that was found in the house of the LORD. And he stood by a pillar, and made a covenant before the Lord, that they should walk after the Lord, and keep his commandments, and his testimonies, and his statutes, with all their heart, and with all their soul, to establish the words of this covenant which were written in this book. And all the people entered into the covenant.... And the king commanded the people, saying, Keep the passover unto the LORD your God, as it is written in the book of this covenant. . . . Josiah also purged out all the diviners, the interpreters of signs, the graven images, and the idols, and all the abominations that were seen in the land of Judah, and in Jerusalem; that he might establish the words of the law which were written in the book which Hilkiah the priest found in the house of the LORD." Because of these reforms Josiah is praised that "there was no king like him before him, who turned to the Lord with all his heart, with all his soul, with all his strength, according to all the law of Moses; and after him came not his like", 2 Kings 22:8 ff. 23, 1. ff. 21. ff.

Finally, we come to the books written after the exile: Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and can be all the shorter with these, since even the newer critics do not deny that in these books the most manifold statements about the Pentateuch, as written by Moses, are found and that the book is constantly assumed to exist and to be known. Modern critics, therefore, prefer simply to deny the credibility of these books, especially of Chronicles. 1) We only point out that the

and institutions by which Charlemagne had endeavored to elevate and civilize his subjects. Before the close of the century in which he died the whole body of his laws had fallen into utter disuse throughout the whole extent of his Gallic dominions. They who have studied the charters, laws, and chronicles of the later Carlovingian princes most diligently are unanimous in declaring that they indicate either an absolute ignorance or an entire forgetfulness of the legislation of Charlemagne.' Will the critics apply the same rule to Charlemagne that they do to Moses, and infer that he never gave the laws attributed to him?" ("The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch," p. 156 f.)

1) In what interest this is done, one of the fathers of today's higher criticism, De Wette, already stated quite clearly almost a hundred years ago: "Just as the whole of Jewish history, from its most interesting and important side, namely that of religion and cultus, after the news of the Chronicle has been cleared away . . . acquires an entirely different shape: so also the investigations concerning the Pentateuch at once receive an entirely different turn: a great deal of troublesome evidence, difficult to be cleared away, of the former existence of the Mosaic books has disappeared." ("Contributions to the Introduction to the Old Testament," I, p. 145.)

most of the passages mentioned above from the books of Kings have exact parallel statements in the books of Chronicles (comp. 1 Kings 2, 3. with 1 Chron. 23, 13.; 2 Kings 11, 12. with 2 Chron. 23, 11. also v. 18.; 2 Kings 14, 6. with 2 Chron. 25, 4.; 2 Kings 21, 8. with 2 Chron. 33, 8.). It is recorded of Jehoshaphat's time that this king sent princes, Levites, and priests into the cities of Judah, to teach the people everywhere. "And they taught in Judah, having with them the law-book of the LORD," the Pentateuch, ^2 Chron. 17, 7. ff. In the account of Hezekiah's celebration of the Passover, which "was not kept for a long time as it is written" (i.e., in the Book of the Law), it is said that the priests and Levites "kept in their ordinance according to the law of Moses the man of God," 2 Chron. 30, 5. 16. The book found by Hilkiah in the temple is quite definitely called "the book of the law of the LORD, given by Moses," 2 Chron. 34:14; and of the Passover feast of Josiah, it is likewise said that the sacrifices were offered "as it is written in the book of Moses," 2 Chron. 35:12. In the book of Ezra it is said of the returned exiles that they "built the altar of the God of Israel, to offer burnt offerings thereon, as it is written in the law of Moses, the man of God," Ezra 3:2; at the dedication of the second temple they "set the priests in their order, and the Levites in their charge, to serve God who is in Israel, as it is written in the book of Moses," Ezra 6:18.Ezra himself is repeatedly called a skillful scribe "in the law of Moses," "in the law of the LORD," "in the law of the God of heaven," Ezra 7:6, 10, 12. But in the book of Nehemiah it is said at the very beginning, in Nehemiah's prayer to God, "We are gone mad, because we have not kept the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which thou commandedst thy servant Moses." And then Nehemiah reminds the Lord of the words which he commanded Deut. 30:4, 28:64. to his "servant Moses," Neh. 1:7. ff. At the service of Ezra and Nehemiah the "Book of the Law of Moses" was read out constantly and mentioned no less than eleven times in eighteen verses, Neh. 8, 1. ff. The same happened at the great repentance ceremony of the people, Neh. 9, 3. and likewise it is said at the end of the book that "at that time the book of Moses was read in the ears of the people; and it was found written in it, that the Ammonites should never come into the congregation of God," with which reference is made to Deut. 23, 3. Among all the historical books of the Old Testament, only in the book of Esther, which was probably written in a foreign country, in Persia, and under very special circumstances, is there no evidence of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. And this, too, is important. For, according to modern criticism, this book was written at a time when even the boldest skepticism would have regarded the written Pentateuch in its present form as a "myth.

If one has to acknowledge the existence of a written work, but no statement about it, this shows quite instructive how careful one has to be to draw conclusions about the non-existence of it from the non-mention of a written work.

We have, therefore, given these testimonies from the historical books for the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch quite abundantly, in order now to contrast how modern criticism, which denies the Book of Five to Moses, comes to terms with these testimonies. Even these clear and definite statements are lightly dismissed. Let us again hear Strack's judgment: "The passages of the Book of Joshua in which the Law Book of Moses is mentioned (1:7, 8, 8:30-35, 23:6) belong to the Deuteronomic treatment of the Book of Joshua and refer only to the Law contained in Deuteronomy. Neither in the book of Judges nor in the book of Samuel is there any mention of a book written by Moses (the name Moses only 1 Sam. 12, 6. 8.). The verses of 1 Kings 2, 2-4, where the "Law of Moses" is mentioned, are certainly written by the exiled editor of the Book of Kings (S. Driver, p. 190) and also need only be referred to the Law in Deuteronomy. In 2 Kings 14:6 he says that Amaziah acted "as written in the book of the law of Moses," thus probably also prompted by this book; but the passage quoted is in Deut. 24:16. Hezekiah, according to 2 Kings 18:6, 12. Hezekiah kept the commandments of God given through Moses, and therefore possessed them in written form; but there is no sure trace that the law outside of Deuteronomy is meant; compare also 21:8 (Manasseh) and 23:25 (Josiah). Solomon's dedicatory prayer for the temple, 1 Kings 8:22 ff. which is to be mentioned here on account of vv. 53, 56, is full of touches with Deuteronomy and the related pieces of the Book of Joshua. - The books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Daniel, because post-exilic, are not to be used without further ado as external testimonies." 1) And to this we conclude a longer exposition by Steuernagel, in order to give the reader an insight into the argumentation of the critics: "Neither the Pentateuch nor the Book of Joshua contain any statement concerning their author, they are therefore anonymous works. About the author of Joshua also in the other writings of the Old Testament no indication is found. How far there are statements about the writing of the Pentateuch in the rest of the Old Testament, this question requires a closer investigation. There are quite a number of passages in the Old Testament in which a "Book of the Law of Moses" is mentioned. This could refer to a book written by someone other than Moses, but which nevertheless bore this title, because it contained a law given by Moses and at first handed down orally. But it is more natural to interpret this title in such a way that by it Moses is designated as the author of the law book.

1) "Introduction to the Old Testament." Fourth edition, p. 24 f.

should. However, it would be hasty to see in all these passages evidence that Moses was considered the author of the Pentateuch. Rather, the question must be raised in each case whether our Pentateuch is meant by that book of the Law of Moses or another work. - The existence of our Pentateuch can be proved with certainty since the middle of the 4th century. From this time on, the Book of the Law of Moses is often mentioned, first in Chronicles. If the content or even the wording of a passage of the Book of the Law of Moses is sometimes mentioned here and the same content or wording is found in our Pentateuch (cf. e.g. 2 Chron. 25, 4. with Deut. 24, 16.), it cannot be doubted that the chronicler cites our Pentateuch as the Book of the Law of Moses, i.e. that he regards it as a book written by Moses. - But if we go back to older times, the existence of our Pentateuch cannot be proved with certainty. All the passages that have been cited as evidence of its existence always prove, strictly speaking, at most the existence of individual parts of it. But from the outset we must at least reckon with the possibility that the Pentateuch is a work composed of various parts. The existence of these parts does not prove the existence of the complete work. If, therefore, before the fourth century, the Book of the Law is cited to Moses, and if the citation can be found in any part of the Pentateuch, then it can only be concluded with certainty that the part of the Pentateuch to which this passage belongs was traced back to Moses. Such citations are found, apart from the Book of Joshua, whose composition is unknown at first, and of which we can therefore make no use for this investigation, only in writings that were not written before the seventh century, and they always refer, as far as they can be proved, only to the part Deut. 12 ff (cf. e.g. 2 Kings 14, 6). E. g. 2 Kings 14, 6. with Deut. 24, 16., and 2 Kings 22, 8.-23, 25. with Deut. 12 ff.). (Of course, passages in which the Code is not expressly traced back to Moses, and in which the citation does not at the same time have to be referred with some certainty to a constituent part of the Pentateuch, are to be left out here). We therefore come to the conclusion that (apart from the self-statements of the Pentateuch) the view that individual parts of the Pentateuch were written by Moses can be proven with certainty only since the 7th century, and that only since the time of the chronicler was the entire Pentateuch traced back to Moses." 1)

To go into every sentence of the critics would lead too far. We will only touch on the main points and note the following. The critics must concede with Steuernagel that it is the most natural thing to take the scriptural statements quoted above from Moses as the author of the Pentateuch.

1) "General Introduction to the Hexateuch," p. 250 f.

to understand. But no sooner have they made this concession than they again evade the most natural understanding of the words and seek excuses. That judges itself. - Further, we ask: If any one hears the expressions so often used, "Book of the Law," "Law of Moses," "Book of Moses," "Code of Moses," and finds references and allusions to them, will he not at once and without doubt admit that a certain, known, existing work must be meant by them? Who on earth concludes that when a quotation from a book, or a reference to it, is given, it is only to prove the existence of that particular portion? What reasonable man, except a superior critic filled with prejudices and preconceived opinions, will, when confronted with a well-known, well-attested, unified, and well-rounded work, have to reckon from the outset with the possibility that this book is a work composed of various parts? And what is to be said to the fact that the testimony of the Book of Joshua is simply erased, or that the passages in question are drawn, as Strack does, to the "Deuteronomic treatment of the Book of Joshua," that is, to the additions later added to the book by the unknown Deuteronomist? Or that the first verses from the Book of Kings, where the Law of Moses is spoken of, "certainly come from the exilic editor of the Book of Kings," that is, are again interpolations of an unknown scribe of later times? This is indeed a convenient way of getting rid of troublesome testimonies, that passages which speak against one's own opinion are dismissed as forgeries, and thus deprived of their probative force.

Only one objection of the critics might at first sight be somewhat disconcerting, namely, that all the above statements and relations refer only to the law contained in Deuteronomy. This is connected with the assertion, discussed earlier, that the passages in the Pentateuch, where it is said of Moses: "He wrote this law", "he finished writing all the words of this law", Deut. 31, 9. 24, also refer only to Deuteronomy. 1) The book which Hilkiah found in the temple and delivered to King Josiah was also only Deuteronomy, and, according to the "positive" among the newer critics, really an old law-book which had temporarily fallen into oblivion; according to the adherents of the radical unbelieving school of Wellhausen, on the other hand, a work first written at that time by clever priests, laid down in the temple, and then fraudulently passed off as an old law-book. Let us therefore consider this objection. Even if only Deuteronomy were really cited in the passages given above, this would not obscure anything. For the Pentateuch is such a unified work that,

1) April issue of "Lehre und Wehre", p. 100 ff.

even if only a part of it, Deuteronomy, were referred to, the whole work would still be authenticated. We have also recognized before that the words in Deuteronomy: "This law", XXXX XXXXX, refer not merely to Deuteronomy, but to the whole law.') Strack, too, if he wishes to be honest, must express himself very tortuously: "The verses 1 Kings 2, 2-4. need only be referred to the law in Deuteronomy." In 2 Kings 18:6, 12, "there is no sure trace that the law is meant outside of Deuteronomy." He must therefore admit that in the passages he cites one can also find quotations from other books of the Pentateuch. And this is indeed the case, and his whole argumentation therefore falls down. For when, for instance, it is said of King Josiah, "Keep the passover to the Lord your God, as it is written in the book of this covenant," 2 Kings 23:21, one will justly have to think not only of the ordinance of the feast, Deut. 16:1 ff, but also of that given in Deut. 23:5 ff, and even of the fundamental passages, Deut. 12:15 ff, Deut. 13:6 ff. 23, 15, and the latter all the more, because the last mentioned passage is in the "Book of the Covenant" written by Mofe, Ex. 24, 4. 7. And when in the book of Nehemiah it is told that the children of Israel celebrated the feast of tabernacles eight days, according to the publicly read "law which the Lord commanded by Moses," Neh. 8, 14. 18., then Deuteronomy cannot be meant at all, but the whole Pentateuch must be understood by it, since this order of the eight-day feast is not in Deuteronomy at all, but in Leviticus, Cap. 23, 34. ff. 2) But if here the expression "law," "book of the law of Moses," signifies the quite definite size, the well-known five-book, it is pure arbitrariness if in the other passages above mentioned another term, for instance, only Deuteronomy, is to be understood by it. And therefore the book found by Hilkiah in the temple is not only Deuteronomy, but the whole Pentateuch, for it is introduced, apart from other reasons to be given now, with the designation standing for the whole Book of Five, "Book of the Law," 2 Kings 22:8, "Book of the Law of the Lord, given by Moses," 2 Chronicles 34:14. 34, 14. The testimony of the historical books of the Old Testament to the Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch is clear and definite and irrefutable. L. F.

(To be continued.)

1) April issue, p. 100 ff.
2) April issue, p. 104.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Watertown Free Conference. A free conference was held at Beloit, Wis. in May of last year. The suggestion for it came from private patrons. At the conference, ways and means were discussed to remedy the divisions within the Lutheran Church in America. It was decided to hold free, intersynodal conferences at which the pastors of the various synods could discuss the points of doctrine in dispute. The first of these conferences was held in the auditorium of Northwestern University at Watertown, Wis. on May 29 and 30. It was announced in the "Gemeindeblatt" by Father M. Bunge, the chairman of the committee for the organization of this meeting, as a free conference for the "discussion of controversial doctrinal points, with the intention of achieving true unity of spirit between members of those synods which principally stand on the standpoint of the Holy Scriptures and all Lutheran confessional writings - also the Formula Concordiae. About 205 pastors, professors and members of congregations from various Lutheran Synods appeared at the conference: 85 from the General Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan, 62 from the Missouri Synod, 15 from the Ohio Synod, 15 from the Iowa Synod, 2 from the Buffalo Synod, 2 from the Norwegian Synod, 2 from the Michigan Synod, 1 from the General Council and 3 single pastors. Prof. A. Ernst, of Watertown, was elected chairman, whereupon M. Bunge, of the WisconsinSynod, in an address, stated the purpose of the meeting. At the request of the Arrangements Committee, Prof. Pieper of St. Louis had agreed to deliver a lecture for the meeting on "the fundamental difference in the doctrine of conversion and election of grace." It was unanimously decided by the conference to hear this lecture and to make it the starting point of the negotiations. No definite result was reached. It was decided, however, to hold a second conference in the autumn. The preparations for this meeting are to be made by the following committee: P. H. Dörmann (Ohio Synod), P. Weng (Iowa Synod), P. Jäger (Wisconsin Synod), 1. Strafen (Missouri Synod), P. Albrecht (Minnesota Synod), P. Grabau (Buffalo Synod), Pros. Larsen (Norwegian Synod), Director Beer (Michigan Synod), Dr. Nicum (General Council), P. Sieck (English Missouri Synod), P. Seifert (Michigan District of the General Synod of Wisconsin). - From the numerous meetings for ecclesiastical unification which have been held in recent years in Germany, England, Australia, and America, between various ecclesiastical communities and synods, the Free Conference of Watertown differs chiefly in the following points: 1. that real unity in spirit, in doctrine, was sought; 2. that differences were not sought to be covered up and disguised, but were sharply considered; 3. that it was not concealed that there was no difference of opinion, but that there was no difference of opinion. 3. that it was not concealed that unity pleasing to God could only be achieved if the existing doctrinal differences were really eliminated; 4. that unity was not made dependent on things that are not necessary for ecclesiastical unity (i.e., neither too little nor too much was demanded); 5. that the negotiations proceeded from the premise that the infallible source and norm of all doctrine is the Holy Scriptures, with which the Lutheran symbols agree. - As we have seen in all Union meetings, which are outwardly united.

If we abhor as hypocrisy the striving for truth without inner truth, we heartily rejoice over every free conference which pursues the purpose of helping divine truth to victory. F. B.

Free Conference. From the "Lutheraner" we place here the following report on the "free conference" in Watertown: "In Watertown, Wis., on April 29 and 30, in the auditorium of the high school of the Hon. Wisconsin Synod, the 'free conference' was assembled, which has already been mentioned in an earlier number of the 'Lutheraner'. The conference bore the character of a free meeting. The participants had not been delegated by their synods, but had appeared at the invitation of a committee formed from several synods. Nor did participation in the conference imply any recognition of the doctrinal position of the opponent. The undersigned (Prof. F. Pieper) spoke on the "Basic Difference in the Doctrine of Conversion and Election by Grace" in such a way that he did not quote either from the writings of the Synodal Conference or from the writings of its American opponents, but explained the following main points on the basis of Scripture and in consideration of earlier struggles in the church: 1. We know from Scripture the cause of conversion and salvation in those who are actually converted and saved: it is God's grace alone in Christ. (2) We know from the Scriptures the cause of unconversion and perdition in those who actually remain unbelieving and are rejected: it is the fault of men alone, namely, their reluctance or misconduct, which they oppose to the converting efficacy of the Holy Spirit in the Word. (3) What lies beyond these two truths revealed in Scripture belongs to the incomprehensible judgments and unsearchable ways of God, which we neither can nor ought to search out here on earth. The grace of God, as the cause of salvation, is not to be supplemented by a cause in man as a reason or 'explanation,' whether this be called sending oneself to grace, better conduct, refraining from wilful resistance, self-decision, surrender to the grace that does not work irresistibly, or otherwise, because, according to Scripture, the natural man is an enemy of the grace of God until the grace of God, through conversion, has made a willing one out of a non-willing one. The guilt or misconduct of man, as the cause of his perishing, is not to be set side by side with a lack of grace in God, as if God did not earnestly desire to make all men blessed, since the Scriptures most clearly teach the universality of the grace of God, the merit of Christ, and the earnest efficacy of the Holy Spirit in all hearers of the Word. It has been pointed out, that the very passages of Scripture which deal with hardening, prove not a passing by with grace, but a entering in of God with grace. (4) Thus, in view of the fact that, according to Scripture, the grace of God is universal, and that all men are in the same total ruin, there is no reasonable answer to the question why all men are not converted and saved, or why, among men, some are converted and saved before others. This is a mystery which cannot be solved here, because it could only be solved in a blasphemous way, either by denying the universal grace of God, or by placing the cause of salvation in man. 5. (5) Nor must the fact that the gospel does not in fact reach all peoples and all individuals at all times lead us to doubt God's earnest general will of grace, or to place two contradictory wills in God. On the contrary, with our concordia formula we must also at this point

a mystery that cannot be solved in this world. In eternal life we will see that God also seriously wanted to save those to whom his word did not actually come, just as he really and truly gave his Son to die for them. - These and many other relevant points were discussed for two days. At first there was no result. But it was decided - as it seemed with great joy - to hold another 'free conference' in the autumn of this year. The participation was more than expected numerous. The large auditorium of the Watertown High School was more than filled."

Unification Thought. About the Watertown Conference, "The Chicago Banner" writes: "Conferences, like the one just held in Watertown, though too narrow in its invitations, will help to bring about a better spirit, while those more general ones, held in Philadelphia, will ultimately prove themselves more successful toward the unification of the whole Lutheran Church." By "too narrow in its invitations," the critic is referring to the committee's invitation, in which only those Lutherans were invited to participate who officially professed all the symbols of the Lutheran Church. We, for our part, would have no hesitation in negotiating caeteris paribus with those who officially profess only the Augsburg Confession or even only the Small Lutheran Catechism. As things stand, the "official" confession of a confession has long since ceased to be a mark of actual orthodoxy. What matters in these "free conferences," if anything is to come out of them, is this, that Christian doctrine, and not deaconesses' houses, "a common liturgy," and similar things, be discussed on the basis of Scripture. It is a great deception for "The Chicago Banner" to suppose that there is unanimity of doctrine among those who call themselves Lutherans, because all 7155 pastors profess Luther's Small Catechism and the Augsburg Confession. In fact, neither Luther's Small Catechism nor the Augsburg Confession is taught in the General Synod. Nor do the participants in the Watertown Conference imagine that they agree on the doctrines of the Lutheran Small Catechism. The issues that divide us are catechism issues. That is the way it has always been. The later Melanchthon, in fact, no longer accepted the Lutheran Small Catechism and the Augsburg Confession. If we were to treat at "free conferences" merely the one question, "What is Christianity?" the greatest differences would soon become apparent. We find proof of this in the number of the "Chicago Banner" before us. In the article, "The Faith of American Leaders," as evidence of Senator Thomas C. Platt's Christianity, is cited the following letter from Platt: "The qualities of divine goodness are marvelously illustrated and actualized in the character of Jesus Christ, and His life is a remarkable revelation of the *inherent possibilities of human nature.*" This is at best Harnackian paganism, but not biblical Christianity. Equally atrocious is what is quoted on the same page from Göthe under "Valuable Testimony." The doctrine of works, that is, paganism, appears not only among the sects, but also among the "Americanized" Lutherans at every turn. They often speak in such a way that one gets the impression that Christianity, namely the gospel, is a deeply hidden secret to them, in spite of their "official" recognition of Scripture and the Lutheran confession. F. P.

The "Church Bulletin" of the Iowa Synod of May 2 also states the following **about the principles of church fellowship**: "It is therefore, after the

The confession of our church Church fellowship is possible only where the confession of the church is fully recognized and accepted. But where it is possible, it is also necessary. It is God's will that we be diligent to maintain unity in the Spirit through the bond of peace, Eph. 4:3. It is not left to the discretion of a Lutheran synod whether or not it wants to extend the hand of fellowship to another that really stands with it on the same confession. It would sin against the will of God, against the commandment of brotherly love. Of course, not all who call themselves Lutherans are Lutherans; not all who accept the confession accept it in the right spirit. Where, for example, communion with those of other faiths is practiced in the Lutheran church, the Lutheran confession is broken in an important point, and there can be no question of church fellowship as long as such un-Lutheranism is tolerated at Lutheran altars. But differences of constitution, historical idiosyncrasies, language, special preferences for individual doctrines or a theological direction may not annul church fellowship. If, in addition to the general confession of the church, a synod were to make such idiosyncrasies the basis of church fellowship, it would have to become a sect and separate itself from the body of the Lutheran church. Neither a broad-minded unionism, which arbitrarily expands the limits set by the confession, nor a narrow-minded separatism, which narrows them, can stand before the confession of our church." - What does the "Kirchen-Blatt" mean by "special preference for individual doctrines or a theological direction"? Anything can hide behind this phrase. The "Kirchliche Zeitschrift" also renews against Missouri the old reproach that it demands more for church unity than is necessary. Father Deindörfer writes in the same (p. 54): "The Synod of Iowa, for example, would not have come into existence if the Synod of Missouri had not counted points as the basis of church unity which did not belong to it." What Missouri makes, and ever has made, the sine qua non of church fellowship, is agreement in all the articles of doctrine, and the same demand^uch Scripture and Confession. F. B.

"**Missouri demands more than is necessary for church unity." The** "Lutheran World" also makes this claim. Missouri teaches that unity in doctrine is not enough; "unity in spirit" is also necessary. Referring to "Lehre und Wehre" (Vol. 48, p. 369), the "Lutheran World" writes: "Before there can be union 'there must be unity of spirit.' (Thus 'Doctrine and Wehre.') This is setting up another bond of union in addition to that so much mooted in Missouri circles. Unity of doctrine is not sufficient, though the Confession in Art. VII says that it is. An extra-confessional condition is laid down before these Lutherans will fellowship their fellow Lutherans." The "Lutheran World" does not know that in the Lutheran Church unity of spirit means unity of doctrine! That is strong. But the "Lutheran World" gives us a glimpse not only of its Lutheran understanding, but also of its anti-Missourian feelings. It writes of the Missourians: "In some way these people have come under the delusion that they alone follow the Word, and that they alone have the true spirit, whereas, in the judgment of others, their condemnation of all Lutherans not in their fold condemns them before the Christian world and before God's Word. - The assertion that Missourians condemn all Lutherans outside their fold is certainly not due to defective discernment, but to temporary displeasure. That, however, the Missourian certainty of truth is incomprehensible to the "Lutheran World," we understand. With skeptical

Unionists and Syncretists, who themselves do not know what they believe, it cannot be otherwise. A true Missourian, however, knows what he believes, and holds his doctrine to be true, and every contrary doctrine to be false. If he did not believe his doctrine to be true and certain, he would not believe it. To believe means to be certain that something is true. Therefore, what the "Lutheran World" demands of the Missourians is not modesty, but basically nothing other than that they should not believe what they believe by God's grace. But this is an immoral demand, which the "World" will not uphold. By the way, we can also tell the "Lutheran World" how a Missourian becomes certain of his doctrine, namely, by taking his reason captive and adhering in all simplicity to the infallible and clear word of the Holy Scriptures.

F. B.

Unionism in General Convention. The Watertown Free Conference was convinced that there were real doctrinal differences among the Lutheran synods, and that these differences really had to be resolved if there was to be "godly" unity. The "Lutheran Church Review", however, seems to be of a different opinion. In it, Carl Swensson of the Augustana Synod, which belongs to the Conciliar, writes in an article on the problems of the Lutheran Church in America: "Our Lutheran theology in America is at the present time in a most satisfactory condition." "If we lay aside our small differences for the greater things held in unison by all of us, then the Lutheran Church of 1953 shall be one of the greatest religious forces." "The German Lutheran comes from Luther's own homeland, and it is natural for him to feel that his kind of Lutheranism is the best, or even the only right kind in existence. The Swedish Lutheran hails from the country of the valiant Gustavus II Adolphus, the defender of Protestantism, and he quite unconsciously comes to think his special duty to be the virile defense of true Lutheranism, *i. e., the* Swedish kind. The American, but Lutheran, shares in the native pride of this great country. . .. How will it end? As it always does. Every family quarrel in any well-ordered Christian household must lead to mutual confession and forgiveness. We must, and we will, by and by, 'kiss and make up.'"-All efforts at unity which spring from contempt of the doctrines of distinction lead to unionism, and are only a hindrance to true unity. The less of it, the better for the church. How far Swensson is willing to go in church fellowship with false believers he showed at the dedication of the World's Fair buildings in St. Louis, at which he entered into prayer fellowship with the Papist Gibbons, the Episcopalian Potter, the Methodist Hendrix, the Presbyterian Niccolls, the Baptist Harper, and the Reform Jewish Harrison. Gibbons, Potter, and Hendrix provided the "religious exercises" on the first day, Swensson and Niccolls on the second, and Harper and Harrison on the third. In the "Lutheran" of 14 May this way of acting is not censured, but rather the stentorian voice with which Swensson knew to make himself understood is praised.

F. B.

Unionist Unification Efforts. For several years now we have been reading much about church unions and unionistic efforts in all Christian countries. In England the Nonconformists have united, in Scotland several Free Churches, in Australia the Presbyterians are drawing closer to the Congregationalists, in New Zealand several denominations are striving for a union, in Germany they want to bring all the national churches under one roof, the Allgemeine

The 2nd Lutheran Conference seeks to establish an international union of all Lutherans, and in America, too, there has been no lack of all kinds of attempts at unification. With a few exceptions, however, all these efforts bear the stamp of unionism and indifferentism on their foreheads. This is especially true of the meeting held in Pittsburg on April 22 and 23 to unite the Congregationalists, United Brethren, Methodist Protestants, and "Christians." Thirty-eight representatives from these bodies were present. During the negotiations, however, it soon became apparent that the prospects of uniting with the Christians' Connection were hopeless, since it would not tolerate any confession and would only accept character as a test of fellowship and not any other name as Christian. The Congregationalists took a middle position. They allowed the Methodist Protestants and United Brethren a confession, but did not want to be bound to any confession as a test. All representatives (with the exception of the Christians, who rejected all confessions) agreed to this. All attempts, however, which were now made to unite the three bodies which had been satisfied on the confession question, failed on the constitutional question. The Congregationalists would not sacrifice their liberty, and the other two bodies refused to surrender their organization. Finally, however, the representatives agreed (probably only pro corma) to recommend to their respective communions the formation of a "General Council of the United Churches," which, however, should not be given any rights over the existing communions. From the beginning, the representatives in Pittsburg agreed that unity of faith was quite irrelevant to unification. The leading spirit in the negotiations, Dr. Ward of the "Independent", writes with reference to the proceedings in Pittsburg: "There was a time when men thought that if we did not hold a particular intellectual belief as to whether the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father alone, or also from both the Father and the Son, he would without doubt perish everlastingly. We have all got over that cruel notion now." "Their ways (®εbrduφε) are what now keeps Christians apart more than their beliefs." "The right way is for those to take their creeds who want them, and those to discard them who have no use for them. It is not what *we* hold and do that keeps us apart, but what we want others to hold and do." - The news that the Congregationalists are seeking a union with the Unitarians has recently caused a great stir. But whoever considers that crass indifferentists like Dr. Ward set the tone among the Congregationalists and lead the word in their journals, is not surprised at this either. - In California it is the Episcopalian Dr. Heber Newton who makes much talk of himself and his plans for unification. He believes (as he puts it) that he has found the "common denominator of religions" and wants to fraternize all churches by eliminating the doctrines of distinction." The "Churchman", on the other hand, proposes the opposite way in its number of April 18. He writes: "It is not by eliminating all the primary colors of the spectrum, but by blending them, that we get the white light of truth." - From these and similar unionist attempts at unification the Lutheran Church can and should learn only the sic non canitur. F. B.

Guarantee of Assistance Funds. The New York Conference of the Department, at its meeting in South Brooklyn on May 6, resolved: "1. That every municipality receiving assistance from the Department henceforth shall be required to sign a bond in lawful form by its trustees in the name of the municipality; 2. That such bond shall bear no interest and shall be valid for twenty years.

(3) That the amount of such bond, if required to be redeemed, shall be equal to the amount of assistance actually given by the Department; (4) That there shall be attached to each such bond an official letter giving in clear terms to each such municipality an assurance that the redemption of such bonds will not be required unless such municipality shall arbitrarily sever its connection with the Department of New York and adjoining States and countries." - I wonder if that will help. Good service is a sure and worthy means of tying congregations to a synod. F. B.

The additions to the Westminster Confession have now also been accepted by the great majority of presbyteries. Only a few have rejected them in part, and only two in toto. This is a great victory for the revisers and a painful defeat for the "Presbyterian," which has zealously and persistently fought against the bills adopted in New York as "unwise, defective, and misleading. But, as it appears, the "Presbyterian" has not yet lost all courage and hope. Hundreds of pastors and thousands of elders and laymen are still opponents of the revision. The last word in the matter would be the next General Assembly, which could still throw everything over. Therefore it is now necessary to prepare for this assembly. - But if one may draw a conclusion from the easy game the revisers had in New York, then the prospects of the "Presbyterian" are dim. F. B.

Four Directions in the Episcopal Church. Jones, a Ritualist, who openly advocates reunion with Rome, says in his paper, "Lamp," that there are four directions in the Episcopal Church: 1st, the Anglo-Catholic party; 2nd, the Roman party; 3rd, the Protestant-Evangelical party; and 4th, the Liberal or Rationalistic direction. The Roman party is extensively the smallest, but intensively the most zealous. It openly advocates a penitential return to the fold of the Roman mother church, and declares the Reformation to be an error which can only be rectified by early reunion with Rome. In England this party is represented by the English Church Union, headed by Lord Halifax. The organ of this party in America is the "Lamp," edited by Jones. From this party Rome receives its converts: lately Lloyd in Tokyo, Evans in London, and Macpherson in America. How far this party goes is shown by the "Lamp," in which Jones writes: "Anglicans who glory in their separation from the Apostolic See, glory in their shame!" "The terminus ad quem of the Oxford movement seems to us to lie by logical and divine necessity in the resubmission of the English Church to the supreme authority of the Holy See." In the same paper there is an appeal for the formation of a Rosary League, and also a demonstration of how the Rosary should be prayed. So one of the prayers to Mary suggested begins, "I salute thee, Immaculate Spouse of God the Holy Ghost." - But not all ritualists and High Churchmen go so far. The Anglo-Catholic party, it is true, also introduces all sorts of Roman doctrines and ceremonies into the Church, but of submission to the Pope it wants, for the present at least, to know nothing. To this party also belongs Bishop Grafton of Fond du Lac, whom we have already mentioned several times. To him religion is absorbed in ceremonies. Recently he wrote in "Munsey's Magazine" -. "Ritualism is based on divine sanction, and adapted to human needs." "God is a ritualist, Nature is only God thinking out loud." That these spirits, to whom religion is essentially ceremonial pomp, are not immune from the wiles of Antichrist, is obvious. They are ripe fruits which, at the slightest wind...

The Pope's own impulses will fall into his lap. - Representatives of the rationalistic direction within the Episcopal Church have already been mentioned several times, and this time we add Dr. Rainsford of New York to them. During Lent he gave a lecture in Philadelphia before the Brotherhood of St. Andrew. In the same he dug up his unbelief to the extent that eleven priests brought public charges against him and 108 priests signed a protest against Rainsford's heresies. The priests declare that Dr. Rainsford had presented doctrines which throw Christianity overboard. He had said that sin was something trivial; that the Bible contained errors in the Old and New Testaments; that the virgin birth of Christ was a fable, etc. In the face of the charges brought against him, Rainsford could only be persuaded to explain that he did not deviate from church doctrine in the matter, but only in the form, "in the method of expressing my beliefs. The "CllurcümLQ", who himself often allows himself to be used as a mouthpiece of the rationalist party, steps into the breach for Rainsford. The "Brotherhood of St. Andrew" declared that it was not responsible for anything said by invited priests, and the Bishop of New York apparently thinks an investigation of the matter unnecessary. The "Outlook" and the "Sun" of New York declare: what Rainsford teaches is at present the belief of most famous Churchmen in America as in England. The liberal elements in the Episcopal Church pay homage to the critical and liberal spirit of the age, and as the High Churchmen look to Rome, so these look in the direction of Socinianism. This is also evident from their lax practice. For example, on January 23, Dr. Everett Hale, the spokesman among the Unitarians, was admitted to Holy Communion in Trinity Episcopal Church at Boston. When the High Churchmen expressed their indignation at this, Hale declared that he had often received the Lord's Supper in the Anglican Church. A symptom also of the utter secularization of this lax party are the theatres which they now associate with their churches to attract the people. Thus, in New York, the Archangel Episcopal Church was lately dedicated by Bishop Potter, in which there is not merely a club-hall, but a theatre. In Milwaukee, too, a rector declared, "The stage is the handmaid of the church. " F. B.

Of Methodist perfertionism, the March 11 Christian Apologist writes: "This doctrine occupies such a central position in Methodism that it is called by Warren 'the formal principle of Methodism' ('Syst. Theol.', p. 149), by Stevens 'the great, power-giving idea of Methodism^ by Peck 'the central idea of Christianity'. It has not been authoritatively formulated, but it is unanimously taught by all Methodists that it is the privilege and duty of every believer to be allowed to live a life of perfect love and constant victory over every acknowledged sin by faith in Jesus. According to Wesley, the principle of Christian perfection is complete love for God and for our neighbor, and the fruit of this love is purity of heart and life. Since this is neither an absolute, nor a paradisiacal, nor a legal-Mosaic, but a Christian perfection, it does not exclude growth in grace and knowledge, human defects and infirmities, temptations, trials, and possible apostasy, and always requires the atoning sacrifice of Christ. It is obtained and preserved by faith alone in Christ, as our perfect Redeemer." (Sulzberger, op. cit., p. 445.) There is, however, a difference of opinion as to the manner in which this state of Christian perfection is attained; some take a defini-

Others see in it the gradual growth of the sanctification begun in justification (see Miley, 'Syst. Theol.' II, p. 354 ff.); and while some assume a complete 'eradication' of innate sinfulness (see Lowry, 'Possibilities of Grace').); and while some suppose a complete 'eradication' of innate sinfulness (see Lowry, 'Possibilities of Grace'), most teach a complete 'suppression' of sinful propensities (so Foster, 'Christian Purity,' p. 74; Whedon, 'Commentary on Rom. VII', Miley, op. cit. p. 364)." Recently we read that even this doctrine is preached little more among Methodists. Surely this would not be to be deplored. F. B.

Rabbi Hirsch and the Epworth League. On May 2, the Churchman reported that the Reform Jew, Rabbi Hirsch, had lectured to the Methodist Epworth League at St. James' Methodist Church in Chicago on April 23 on the subject of Our Lord. The Rabbi declared that if JEsus came back tomorrow, he would be worshipped in every Jewish synagogue, not as the Son of God, but as one of the noblest teachers in the world. The Methodists did not notice that Rabbi Hirsch had not praised Christ with this eulogy, but had blasphemed him atrociously. Rather, the speaker's praises were received with a storm of applause, and the entire congregation expressed their thanks to the rabbi by standing up. The meeting closed with a common Lord's Prayer, in which the Reform Jew also participated. - This is a new proof that many Methodists apparently no longer know what Christianity is. F. B.

Of the religious education of youth, The Westminster, a Presbyterian paper in Canada, writes: "The problem of youth education is of incalculable importance to the Church. The future of the Church is bound up with this problem. Are there any prospects of a solution? Admittedly, home education has broken down, the Sabbath school is inadequate, and whether religious education of any kind should be given in the school is an open question. The coming generation of parents will be wholly incapable of teaching the Bible to their children, having themselves been insufficiently instructed." - The solution which the above paper proposes is that the Bible should be driven into the State schools. The only proper solution, the establishment of parochial schools, does not even occur to it as a remote possibility. F. B.

II. Abroad.

Ecclesiastical conditions in Hamburg. In Hamburg, the struggle between the Protestant Association, which dominates the state church there, and the "Church Association," which the Lutheran-minded have brought into being, has flared up brightly. Father Glage is the leader of the Positives, and in several pamphlets he has exposed the unholiness of the conditions in Hamburg. In December of last year, under his influence, there was a large protest meeting of the members and friends of the "Kirchlicher Verein." This was an inducement to the Ritschlianer, Father Köster of Hamburg, to intervene in the controversy. Köster and Glage now fight each other in pamphlets of dispute. Unfortunately, even the church-minded in Hamburg are no longer faithful to the Lutheran confession. They still belong to the Hamburg State Church. But this church demands in the ordination only "a proclamation of the gospel according to the principles of the Lutheran church, as such are fundamentally testified in the Augsburg Confession and the other confessions of this church". Thus the Hamburg State Church shed its Lutheran character. The Saxon "Free Church" says: "The -Confession of the Lutheran-

Lutheran Church in the State of Hamburg therefore bears a great resemblance to the Lichtenbergian knife without a blade, on which the hilt is missing." In fact, the "Lutherans" in Hamburg pay homage to Unionism. Hence it is that they do not go beyond a protest in resolutions. They want to confess with words, but when it is a question of following up words with deeds, they become weak in the knees. And yet action belongs to the nature of a protest. He who protests declares that the matter in question is a matter of conscience. Of the "Protestants" in Hamburg, the Saxon "Free Church" writes: "In Hamburg, for several decades, the abomination of desolation has stood in the holy place. Free-minded preachers, Protestant Unificationists, Ritschlians form the majority of the clergy there and preach a Christianity without Christ. The faithful, who still want to be Christians and Lutherans, have consequently joined together to form little churches in the secularized church, so-called chapel congregations, which take care of their ecclesiastical needs independently. Preachers and members of these chapel congregations sometimes try to convince themselves and others that they are truly independent and have no church fellowship with the Hamburg state church. How unfounded such claims are is evident from the fact that the chapel preachers require the confirmation of the Hamburg Church Council, are introduced into their office by its representatives, and are subject to its supervision in the conduct of their office. In the constitution of 1883 the Hamburg State Church gives itself the name 'Evangelical Lutheran Church in the State of Hamburg', but since it nowhere professes the symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, it bears this name with the same right as the Roman Pabst Church bears the name Catholic. There is likewise no commitment of the church servants to the confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. The formula of obligation at ordination requires of them only 'a preaching of the Gospel according to the principles of the Lutheran Church, as such are fundamentally attested in the Augsburg Confession and the other confessions of this Church'. Thus, not the doctrine proclaimed in the Augsburg Confession and the other confessional writings, but only the principles of the Lutheran Church testified to therein are to be authoritative in the Hamburg Regional Church. By these 'principles' everyone may understand what he pleases, and the liberals understand by them the principles that the Bible is not God's Word, but a book of men like others, and that reason or science is the supreme judge in matters of faith. Thus the Hamburg State Church has ceased to be an Evangelical Lutheran. There is complete doctrinal freedom in it. God's word and man's word, truth and error, yes and no theology is not merely tolerated there, but legally justified. Under these conditions, the liberal preachers and their followers feel themselves masters of the situation. They unabashedly preach their unbelief and blaspheme the biblical Christian faith in word and scripture. And what do those do against this who still want to be Christians and Lutherans? They complain about the growing influence of liberal theology, occasionally protest against a particularly impudent attack by it on biblical Christianity, and may well receive a rebuke from their ecclesiastical authorities for it - but in all other respects everything remains the same. Thus in 1894 Fr. Glage protested at St. Anschar's Chapel against the liberal theology and its representatives in a little paper: 'Emergency cry to the Christians on and under the pulpits of Hamburg'. This 'cry of distress' died away without effect. Father Glage received a reprimand from the Church Council for it, which the Protestant Association 'greeted with satisfaction', but Father Glage calmly took. " F. B.

The Professors' Days in the Prussian House of Lords. On April 3, a debate on university theology arose again in the Prussian House of Lords. It was again Baron von Dürant who brought up the matter. He advocated the demands made by the Prussian regional churches in their resolutions on professors. It was reprehensible, he said, that modern unbelieving theology, as represented by Harnack and Delitzsch, Baumgarten and Weinel, should be recognized as an equal "direction" in the Church. He, too, did not want to touch free research and science, but there was a difference between free research and unrestricted freedom of teaching, which the opponents probably did not blur without intention. Also, the principle of the equality of the directions, which the liberals claim for the theological faculty, is not recognized in the other faculties. The professors of medicine, for example, were fighting the establishment of a chair of homeopathy with all possible means. The church must either demand the reform of the theological faculties or demand from the state the right to educate its preachers itself. A theology that insisted on its unlimited freedom and a church that knew itself bound to the word of the eternal God were irreconcilable opposites. - Dürant seems to represent the point of view of the modern positive theologians, who differ from the liberal theologians by happy inconsistency. This positive modern theology, in fact, wants to be both at the same time: Science and Scriptural Theology. It wants to ride two horses running in opposite directions at the same time: Scripture and reason. But this is an untenable position and basically nothing more than the upper end of the slippery slope at the bottom of which Harnack, Delitzsch, Baumgarten and Weinel have arrived. This ambiguous position, which does not allow the positives to come to any clarity and firm backbone formation, is in the last analysis also to blame for the fact that all professorial decisions and debates come to nothing. - Count v. Zieten-Schwerin repeatedly and bravely stood by Baron von Dürant in the debate. He emphasized emphatically that Dürant was not alone, as had been asserted the previous year. The great majority of the Protestant members of the conservative party stood on one and the same ground with Dürant, and the overwhelming majority of the representatives of the Prussian national church paid tribute to Freiherr von Dürant for his stand against the promotion of unbelieving theology from state funds. According to the report in the "Christliche Welt," Count Zieten-Schwerin, who was repeatedly President of the General Synod and Chairman of the General Synodal Board, said, among other things: "I hold Messrs. Baumgarten and Weinel in very high esteem, inasmuch as they have the honesty of their convictions, while the great mass of negative theologians at the universities cover themselves with the language of the Holy Scriptures, and otherwise pick apart the whole of the Holy Scriptures by their criticism." - The Minister of Culture, Dr. Studt, held fast to the principles he had expressed the year before, that all schools of thought had equal rights, and that the government had a duty to give them all air and light. But he rebuked Baumgarten in Kiel and condemned Weinel's agitational appearance in Bonn. He concluded with the assurance that the positive direction would not be neglected in the filling of professorships. The Minister of Culture obviously does not approve of the reckless behavior of the radical professors. They may give up their faith, he thinks, but they should preserve their decency! - Dr. Dryander again took a middle position as court theologian. The "Christian World" says: "His mediating speech contained many a good word." He declared his assertion of the previous year that the Reformation was a matter of free science to be a "regrettable misunderstanding. He gave the plight of the evan-

gelische Landeskirche and demanded a restriction of the negative direction. According to the "E. K. Z.," however, he is again said to have declared: "I must cast the old problems into new forms." "Theology must recast the Christian faith in the form of the new science and seek to make the newer views intelligible." The "Kreuz-Zeitung" judged: Dryander "did not find the appropriate words for the precisirung of his standpoint in this question; one unfortunately only gained the impression of a certain vagueness and blurriness." Dr. Dryander apparently played the saddest role of all those involved. Struckmann and Professors Schmoller and Löning boldly represented the standpoint of liberal theology. Löning said: "What the teacher believes to be true, he must communicate to his students. Otherwise he is not worthy of his chair." This nonsensical assertion is a sophistical inversion of the true proposition: "What the teacher communicates to his pupils as truths, he himself must hold to be true." - The result of the debate thus sat "The Old Faith" together: "The liberal phrase of the -Freedom of Science^ retained the last word. To it the Minister of Culture bowed, to it basically also the High Court Preacher paid homage, not to speak of the representatives of the academic teaching authority. If, therefore, any fruit at all is to be expected for the Church, it should at most be that the principle of equal rights for all theological directions should no longer be applied so exclusively in favor of critical radicalism." - The liberal phrase of the "freedom of science" retained the last word. Unfortunately, and basically with the positives as well. And yet "freedom of science" is always and everywhere falsehood and arbitrariness, for in the natural field cognition is bound to the facts of experience, and in the theological field bound to the word of Holy Scripture. F. B.

Heuduck writes in the "E. K. Z." about what the **Ritschlians are concerned with**: "Modern theology is concerned - and this is its characteristic - with fathoming the essence of Christianity according to historical-scientific methods, that is, in such a way that it can lay claim to general validity. If, for example, a theologian, as a modern historian, writes history according to scientific principles, and wants, for example, to give a historical picture of Jesus for which he can count on the recognition of all historically educated people, he cannot present Jesus otherwise than as a religious hero of mankind, as the greatest certainly, but still only as one in the line of illustrious spiritual heroes. If he places Jesus on a higher, superhuman, superhistorical standpoint, he transgresses the limits of science, which he has set for himself by undertaking to represent Christianity scientifically. One may deny the possibility of such a purely historical account, one may ask whether the historical consideration of Jesus is capable of grasping the whole greatness of his personality, and may, as we all do, deny this question, but one must realize that at the present time, when metaphysics does not belong to the sciences in the proper sense, there is no way of looking at the person of Jesus, apart from the historical one, which could lay claim to the predicate -scientific^. As a believing Christian the historian will confess: To me Jesus is more than one of the heroes of past times; to me he stands on the side of God; to me he is the Son of God, the revelation of God, the reflection of divine being, my Saviour; but in a scientific representation such judgments do not belong directly; scientifically this judgment cannot be proved to anyone who has not already shared it before. Here lies the difference between the two directions. For the moderns, faith begins to judge and to recognize where science ends. The

But the traditionalists believe that they must prove the judgments of faith scientifically. So there is a contradiction in the theory of knowledge." (1903, p. 32.) - When the Ritschlians speak of "historical" evaluation of the person of Christ, they understand by it an evaluation from the theory of evolution. Historical is to them synonymous with evolutionistic. Only what has developed naturally is historical to them. Whoever now admits this, whoever denies any intervention of God in the course of the world, to him, however, it is then certain, though not historically and scientifically, yet *a priori* and dogmatistically, that Christ was a man and nothing more. F. B.

Theology and Religion. From the "Gießener Anzeiger" the "Christliche Welt" prints an article characteristic of modern theology, from which we report the following: "Religion and theology are not the same, just as education and knowledge are not the same. Someone can know a great deal, have significant knowledge, and still be quite uneducated. Likewise, someone can be a great theologian and yet be completely devoid of religion. Theology is a science, free, and must be unhampered in research. Neither its result nor its method must be constricted. It must be equal to all other sciences in criticism and further research. It must serve no party, least of all degenerate into a study of bread and butter, that is, as a science. To him who pursues it, no limits are thereby imposed on his outer life; he may resign himself to life in general. Religion is a need of the soul; it requires no previous scientific training; it is rooted in the mind, according to man, just as much as superstition, in alliance with dark powers, as in intercourse with the highest being, with God. Theology is founded on hypothesis. He who puts forward the most tenable one dominates science at present, - he is the spirit-rich one, until a still more spirit-rich one comes and takes away his harness. Theology floats on the heights of society; it influences the majority of the educated, the ruling classes, legislation, external manners, art, and literature; it is acceptable. Religion is founded on faith, on devotion to the worshipped deity, on prayer, on sacrifice, even of the dearest, for the appeasement of conscience or the attainment of a desired end. It creeps in many cases quite in secret, and often hides itself fearfully, because it does not feel itself equal to the controversy of opinions. Theology belongs in the university, in the lecture-rooms, on the cathedra. Religion belongs in the service, in the pulpit, in the congregation. Theology affects the mind by the sharpness of the argument, religion affects the character by the conscience. Theology spins the systems, religion translates them into practical life; from the lectern comes knowledge, from the pulpit enthusiasm; in the silence of the study room the unclear thoughts mature, in the work within the congregation they are tested for their value. Theology trains clergymen, religion demands pastors; theology trains the preacher, religion is the pastor's field. As our life in general exists only through oppositions, for without opposition there is no movement, so it is natural that also between theology and religion oppositions are formed and found. This has always been the case, as church history clearly shows, and is therefore nothing new, as some now think. Such contrasts can lead to strong conflicts, and they have done so, - but were they therefore a harm? Have science and religion suffered thereby? Through some times: yes; but in the long run? Science has always corrected itself where it has erred, and that cannot be otherwise. And religion? it is forced to deepen itself when the currents of the times

They have let them fall into abuses (indulgences). Already the right and wrong that happens to the individual presses for the correction of conscience and action. It is indeed distressing for the student of theology when he hears from the lectern other principles than those he can use in the pulpit, - but for this very purpose he studies, in order to work his way through, in order to gain a truth of conviction that is useful to him in all respects. God allows the honest to succeed' is a wise saying. I have always found that the real student is a critic, - he learns gladly and eagerly, but where he perceives that his conviction is to be captured, opposition immediately stirs in him. It has never yet done any good to sixir one party direction on the cathedra as authoritative, - or rather, it has never yet been of any use to this party; science does not allow itself to be constrained; he who wants to do so stunts its life-blood: the Inquisition only raises martyrs, and through these in turn another edifice: aere perennius, mighty and sublime!" - From this characterization of Schleiermacher's and Ritschl's religion and theology it is evident that it has nothing in common with the Christian religion and theology but the name. The Christian religion is essentially that relation of the sinner to God which comes about through the certainty, drawn from the Gospel, that God is gracious to me for Christ's sake. And Christian theology is not the formation of hypotheses, but essentially the habit of producing and maintaining in others, through the gospel of Christ, religion, the certainty of the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake. The task of Christian theology, therefore, is not to make all sorts of reflections on religion, but to present from Scripture the doctrines of the gospel. Christian theology, therefore, does not lay down any principles which cannot be used in the pulpit and which might be harmful to the Christian. But it is different with theology, which wants to be science. It does not care whether souls perish through its hypotheses. Its ostensible purpose is science, but its real purpose is the elimination of Christianity. F. B.

Why does Delitzsch fight the Bible? Delitzsch answers this question himself in the preface to his second lecture on "Babel and the Bible", in which he writes: "This saying Isa. 63, 1-6. and a hundred other prophetic sayings full of indelible hatred against the nations around: against Edom and Moab, Assur and Babel, Tyre and Egypt, mostly masterpieces of Hebrew rhetoric, are supposed to represent the ethical prophetism of Israel, probably even in its height. These outpourings of political jealousy and, from the human point of view, perhaps understandable passionate hatred of long-dead generations, born out of certain temporal conditions, should also serve us children of the twentieth century after Christ, should also serve the Western and Christian peoples as a religious book for their satiation and edification! Instead of immersing ourselves 'with gratitude and admiration' in the workings of God in our own people from Germanic prehistory to the present day, we continue, out of ignorance, indifference, or blindness, to ascribe to those ancient Israelite oracles a 'revelatory' character that stands up neither in the light of science nor in that of religion or ethics. The deeper I immerse myself in the spirit of the Old Testament prophetic Scriptures, the more fearful I become of Yahweh, who slaughters the nations with his insatiable sword of wrath, who has only One favorite child, but abandons all other nations to night, to shame, to ruin, who already spoke to Abraham (Gen. 12:3): 'I will bless those who bless you, and curse those who curse you' - I take my refuge

I pray to him who taught in life and in death: 'Bless them that curse you,' and I place myself, full of trust and joy and earnest striving for moral perfection, in the God to whom Jesus taught us to pray, the God who is a loving and just Father over all men on earth." - According to this, what Delitzsch cannot tolerate in the Old Testament is the holiness and punitive justice of God which shines forth from it. He wants a God who gives sinners five wrongs a right. Delitzsch lives in sins and will not repent, therefore he hates the God who says, "Ye shall be holy: for I am holy, the LORD your God." But if Delitzsch thinks that the God of the New Testament lets sinners slip through and condemns no one, he is mistaken. The New Testament also knows of no forgiveness and blessedness for Delitzsch as long as he does not want to repent. To the present unbelieving Delitzsch Christ himself calls out, "But he that believeth not shall be damned." F. B.

The Jesuits were expelled: 1561 from Graubünden (already 27 years after their foundation); 1570 from England (because of their assassination attempts against Queen Elizabeth); 1578 from Portugal; 1578 from Antwerp; 1594 from France (because of an assassination attempt by the Jesuit student Chatel on King Henry IV, who, however, admitted them again in 1603); 1595 from all provinces of the Netherlands (as a sect dangerous to the life of princes and the tranquillity of the state); 1606 from the Republic of Venice (as "enemies and slanderers"); 1607 from Sweden; 1610 from the Canton Wallis; 1618 from Bohemia (as "insurrectionists and troublemakers"); 1619 from Moravia and Silesia; 1620 from Hungary; 1621 from Poland; 1622 from Naples; 1645 from Malta; 1706 from Hungary and Transylvania; 1715 from the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies; 1725 from Russia; 1759 from Portugal; 1762 from France; 1767 from Spain, Naples and Sicily; 1768 from Parma; 1815 from Petersburg and Moscow; 1822 from all Russia; 1847 from Switzerland; 1872 from Germany; 1880 from France. Add to this the abolition by Pope Clement XIV. Francis Borgia, the third Jesuit general, is said to have declared, "As lambs we have crept in, like wolves we shall rule, like dogs we shall be chased away, like eagles we shall rejuvenate."

The main church of the Jesuit Order is the Church of the Gesü in Rome. It is not the most beautiful of the 365 churches of Rome, but it is one of the richest and most splendid. Yes, the profusion of ornaments, gold, and marble, with columns of giallo antiho and lapis lazuli, touches the traveller, who has had but a faint glimpse of the nameless misery prevailing on the plains of fair Italy, with true repugnance. Now, beside the high altar of this church stands the colossal bronze statue of Ignatius of Loyola, with two serpents on whose heads the "saint" sets fine feet. These heads bear golden inscriptions visible from afar. They read: "Luther" and "Calvin". It is characteristic that Bädeker's Middle Italy completely conceals this circumstance, which speaks volumes. Should the influence of ultramontanism penetrating into everything have subdued also the "faithful Eccard of the ripening"?

The general synod of the reformed Dutch church discussed the **admission of women to the preaching ministry.** Miss Cremer, a doctor of philosophy, had submitted a request to this effect. The two advisers of the synod, Dr. Offerhaus of Leyden and Dr. Cannegieter of Utrecht, expressed the wish that the synod should resolve to open the pulpit to women. The vote, however, rejected the request by 10 votes to 9. So only by a majority of one vote! F. B.

Concerning the **Education Act,** Stead writes in "Review of Reviews": "The problem immediately confronting the Nonconformists is, whether they will consent to assist in its (the act's) execution. Will they pay rates, or, what is more immediately important, will they serve in the local public bodies which take over the work of the School Boards ? If they refuse, they place the whole of the administration of the Act in the hands of the Clericals. If, on the contrary, they take their seats on the new governing bodies, how can they refuse to pay the rate which they themselves will have levied? Lord Rosebery has told the Nonconformists that if they acquiesce in the new law they will cease to exist politically, and he has added as an afterthought that the Liberal Party will be in the same plight.'!"-"The Eighth National Council of the Free Church Federation" has now decided on passive resistance. This federation, which is composed of all Nonconformists except Papists and Unitarians, and is in many instances already called the "Free Church of England and Wales," held its meeting at Brighton from the 9th to the 13th of March. Besides numerous visitors, over 1700 delegates were present, the highest number ever reached in the Free Church of England. The main subject of the proceedings was, of course, the Education Act. The watchword was, "We will not submit!" Resolutions were passed in which the congregation professed a "passive resistance policy." Already 412 out of 489 local Free church councils had declared themselves in favour of passive resistance. Wales in particular stands like one man against the School Act. It is therefore obvious that the Education Act is finished, if the speeches, resolutions and applause in Brighton are now matched by action. Incidentally, the new Education Act in England has its opponents not only among the Dissenters, but also among the State Church. The Nonconformists are dissatisfied, because they do not like to entrust their children to the Episcopalians. And many Episcopalians are displeased because the law in many places hands the school over to the Ritualists. In the "Fortnightly Review" Dr. Macnamara says that the final result of the Education Act will be the introduction in the schools of a "common family opening service of an undenominational character," and that the denominations will be allowed to give religious instruction before and after school hours. - As for the other countries in Europe, in France the state maintains the church, but the state schools are religionless, nay, downright atheistic. In Belgium religious instruction by a priest is compulsory; but twenty Protestant pupils may demand Protestant instruction. In Italy the state school provides Catholic religious instruction for those children whose parents desire it. In Austria, Catholic religious instruction is compulsory; Protestant children are given Protestant instruction. In Germany and Switzerland the State provides instruction in the Protestant and Catholic religions. In Quebec the state schools are Catholic; but Protestants are permitted to establish private schools with their school taxes. In Ontario the Bible is read in the government schools, and Catholics may establish private schools and assign their school taxes to them. In Manitoba and Australia the State school is religionless; religious instruction does not fall within school hours. F. B.

Church Discipline Bill. In England incense is used in 393 state churches, and in 71 other churches similar papist abuses have been introduced. The Ritualists openly express the hope that they will soon succeed in bringing a large part of the Episcopal Church into the fold of the Roman Church.

Mother Church. Lord Halifax, the leader of the Papist party, wrote recently in "The Nineteenth Century": "The Anglican Church is on the eve of great upheavals." "The movement in England and abroad for union with Rome must at last bear fruit." The state-church bishops seem to have cared little or nothing so far when priests foisted the rosary and other bits of papism on their congregations. And Temple, the recently deceased Archbishop of Canterbury, was more conducive than obstructive to ritualism. If, for once, a bishop exhorted a Papist hot-head in the State Church to moderation in Romanism, he was offered defiance. When, for example, the Bishop of London finally got serious with Evans, who had introduced all the abominations of Pabstism in St. Michael's Shoreditch, Evans openly converted to Pabstism, and on March 25, 70 of his former parishioners were confirmed by the priest Chase and received into the Catholic Church without longer instruction (which Evans had already provided as Anglican pastor). At the same time, news came from Tokyo, Japan, that the Anglican missionary Arthur Lloyd had openly declared that he was a follower of the Pope and that he regularly paid his St. Peter's pence as proof of this. This ritualistic exuberance and this apathy on the part of the Anglican bishops are the cause of the Church Discipline Bill, which was passed on its second reading on March 13 by 190 votes to 139. This Bill gives every layman the right to bring an action in the courts against preachers of the Anglican state church if they introduce papist customs and doctrines contrary to the Book of Common Prayer. At the same time the Bill deprives the bishops of the right of veto, by which they have hitherto been accustomed to remove all such suits from the secular court. If this Discipline Bill is made law, the priests of the Anglican State Church will be directly subject to the secular courts in the administration of their office, and what John Kensit strove for in his sensational agitations against ritualism until his assassination last October will have been substantially accomplished. The bishops and priests of the English state church are, of course, zealously opposed to this bill, chiefly because it significantly curtails their rights and liberties and places the church still more firmly in the shackles of the state. Not in Protestant sentiment - they say - but in hostility to religion in general this Bill has its reason, and its purpose is "to end the Church rather than to mend it". If the Bill were to be passed on its third reading, they would appeal directly to the King to refuse his assent on constitutional grounds. But to these clergy Harcourt aptly replied, "If you do not like interference in this matter, disestablish the Church." It is still specially urged by the opponents of the Bill that the newly elected Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Davidson, should be given an opportunity beforehand to cry "So far and no further!" to Ritualism, which would render the Discipline Bill superfluous. Before a legation of members of Parliament, then, Davidson had already spoken out, though somewhat vaguely, yet vigorously against the Ritualist movement. He declared, among other things: "The sands are running out. Stern and drastic acts are quite essential. I desire that we should act, and act rigorously. Toleration has reached its limit. "It is hoped that this declaration will not fail in its purpose. Minister Balfour, of course, who does not represent the Bill, declared: "I look upon the future of the Church with the gravest anxiety. "He evidently sees in this Bill, too, harbingers of the coming separation of Church and State,

which the Episcopalians so much fear. And from their point of view rightly so, for disestablishment would not only deprive the Episcopalians in England of their political position and rich revenues, but also make many of their members a prey to the Papists and Dissenters. Unlike the Anglican bishops and priests, however, many lay members view the Discipline Bill differently. It would help to postpone the denationalization of the Church indefinitely, because it would help the Anglican Church to a more Protestant face. And that, he said, was the only salvation of the state church in England: "a rapid restoration of the Protestant complexion of the Church of England." - So long as the Episcopal Church in England is the State Church, it is only reasonable that, when the bishops fail in their duty, the congregations should be protected by the secular courts from rape on the part of the ritualists. But in the last analysis what alone can save the Anglican Church from the clutches of Antichrist is not the secular court, but the spread of the doctrine of justification, which has become rare in England. F. B.

The British and Foreign Bible Society has published its ninety-eighth annual report. According to it, the Bible Society distributed no less than 5,067,421 Bibles or parts thereof during the past year. This is the highest number ever reached in one year. The total number of Holy Scriptures distributed by the "British Bible Society" since its existence is thus 175 million. One can scarcely conceive what this means, and how much faithful labour and toil in the service of the kingdom of God this vast number involves. A whole small army of diligent and conscientious translators is constantly at work to bring the Gospel to those who are still "sitting in darkness," and to translate the sacred words into languages which the layman usually does not even know by name. Thus, translations in more than 100 foreign languages are currently being prepared or newly revised, while the total number of Bible translations taken care of by the "Bible Society" includes no less than 367 foreign languages and dialects.

In the Reformed Church in Moravia, illegitimate children are denied baptism until the mother has publicly repented. The fifth paragraph of the discipline regulations of the Reformed Church in Moravia, approved by the Oberkirchenrath, reads: "Illegitimate children are to be baptized only under the condition that the mother of the child is willing to confess her repentance for her sin. Where such a disposition is not present, the pastor will refuse the service of holy baptism to the impenitent person, and no reformed pastor shall receive (take in?) such people and render them ecclesiastical services." On this Rohan remarks in a pamphlet entitled: "Evangelical Clericalism in Moravia": "That the baptism of illegitimate children was already refused, and indeed already before the discipline order discussed here was approved by the Oberkirchenrath, is evident from the already mentioned writing 'Eighth Convention ...', in which from page 54 in the document entitled 'Report on the State of the Reformed Moravian Superintendents;, submitted by the Superintendent.... to the Superintendential Convention held in Brunn on April 10 and 11, 1901, for the period 1895-1901', the reporter says: -And for the sake of completeness of truth, this shadow must be darkened by mentioning some of our struggles with the powers of this world, that is, with the political authorities. These struggles took place mostly in the interdenominational field. One parish priest had difficulties with the imperial and royal district head.

team, because he refused to baptize the mother of about three illegitimate children. After the matter was cleared up by the superintendent, the dispute ceased, but it seems that the same flared up again later. The result, however, is not doubtful. No one can force us to baptism and the sacraments/" - The child is deprived of baptism in order to force the mother to repent. This is not evangelical church discipline, but horrible tyranny against the child as well as against the mother. F. B.

In the "A. E. L. K." we read about **the Talmud and the Tosefta of the Jews**: "It is still unknown to many what the Talmud actually is, this great compilation in which the sayings of the rabbis of several centuries are contained. It is not as if the rabbis had written it all down themselves, but rather that one rabbi learned from another in oral tradition; the traditions were memorized verbatim and thus passed down through the generations, sometimes with the original author or the intermediate elements named, sometimes without them, i.e. anonymously, and only gradually was the enormous material set down in writing. Above all, these sayings are explanations of the Scriptures, or, in later times, comments on the old traditions. With great acumen, taking into account even the smallest details of the sacred text, the problems inherent in it are discussed, followed by questions from all areas of knowledge. The whole is divided into a number of larger sections, called tracts. For example, there is a tractate: 'Sabbath'. This contains the exact investigations of the rabbis about the casuistic execution of the Sabbath laws. The tractates are divided into chapters, which in turn are divided into smaller sections. The whole Talmud resembles a commentary arranged according to the glossatory method. The text, which is commentated, is of course older than the commentary itself. The text of the Talmud is called the Mishnah, the commentary the Gemara. The text dates, on the whole, from the second century A.D., the Commentary from the third, fourth, fifth centuries. Mishnah and Gemara together form the so-called Talmud. There are two such Talmuds, the Palestinian and the Babylonian, both of which contain a Mishnah and a Gemara, and which otherwise also touch each other in many other ways. In addition, there are several collections of rabbinical sayings. One of these parallels the Mishnah in time and in kind. This is the so-called Tosefta, that is, "Additions" to the Mishnah. This, then, like the Mishnah, dates, on the whole, from the second century after Christ, and contains in the main such traditions as were overlooked, or purposely excluded, in the redaction of the Mishnah, and are therefore not now found in the Mishnah. As in the case of the Mishnah, so also in the case of the Tosefta, it can only be said that, on the whole, it dates from the second, post-Christian century; for many passages in it are far older. There are even sayings from pre-Christian times. And for the individual customs one will often be able to assume the time of Christ without hesitation in regard to their age. In any case, however, even in the case of the latest sayings of the Tosefta, we stand in the time of the New Testament writings. Some of the rabbis mentioned lived in Palestine, some in Babylonia; some had migrated from Babylonia to Palestine, others, conversely, from Palestine to Babylon. Where the final redaction of the Tosefta took place, whether in Palestine or Babylon, is a matter of dispute. But in view of the sameness of the circumstances, it is generally unobjectionable to suppose even anonymous traditions as applicable to Palestine." (P. 298.) F. B.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 49. **June 1903.** **No. 6.**

Recent Pentateuch Criticism.

(Continued.)

1.

2. The testimony of the other books of the Old Testament.

The direct and numerous statements of the historical books of the Old Testament about the Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch are followed by the testimony of the poetic and prophetic writings of the old covenant. Naturally, these do not contain such direct statements about Mosi's activity as a writer, nor do they contain so many references to the written law as do the historical books. The occasion for this was lacking, and the character of the poetic and prophetic writings is quite different from that of the historical books. But if we keep in mind what a cloud of witnesses to the Mosaic composition of the five books we have in the historical books from Joshua's time down to the days of the exile and after the exile, we shall be justified in finding in every mention of the law, and likewise in every allusion to passages of the law in the other biblical books written during the same period, a proof that the five books were known among the people of Israel as a very definite, firmly circumscribed quantity, and were recognized by that very fact as the work of Moses. Why should it always be necessary to say, "in the law, written by Moses, is written"? Why should not the simple designation "law" or even the mere allusion have sufficed, since every Israelite must have known that by this was meant the very well-known, definite law, the Torah, XXXXX, which, according to the unanimous testimony of the historical books, came from Moses?

Let us now hear the most important passages first from the poetic books. What connoisseur of the Psalms can fail to recognize that the entire Psalter is nothing other than a glorious testimony to the life of Israel in the Law and under the Law?

The 19th Psalm praises the blessed one who "delights in the law of the Lord, and speaks of his law day and night," Ps. 1:1 f. How does the 19th Psalm praise the "law of the Lord," which is "without change, and restoreth the soul," and the "testimony of the Lord," 1) which is "sure, and maketh the foolish wise," Ps. 19:8 ff; and the 119th Psalm, which begins with the words, "Blessed are they that walk without change, that walk in the law of the Lord," and then, in almost every one of its 176 verses, calls the law by one expression or another. And that this law of the Lord was not a law which the children of Israel had only received through uncertain tradition, which had only been traditionally passed on from parents to children, but the known, definite law given by Moses, is clearly stated in Ps. 103:7: "He hath made Moses to know his ways, the children of Israel his doings." The revelation of God was made known to the children of Israel through Moses, and the expression "the law of the Lord" is equivalent to the statement, "which is revealed through Moses." And as with the doctrinal, so also with the historical content of the Pentateuch the poets of the Psalms are most exactly acquainted, as a glance at Psalms 78, 95, 105, 106 clearly shows, in which the various deeds of God to His people are sung about. Yea, the Pentateuch is also quite directly mentioned as Scripture, when the coming Messiah says Ps. 40, 8. "Behold, I come; in the book" (in the roll of the book, XXX-XXXXX) "is written of me." By this, according to v. 9. "Thy will, my God, do I gladly, and thy law have I in my heart," can only be meant the book which Israel then, in David's time, already possessed, and in which it had the will of God, precisely the law, the Torah of Moses, as Hengstenberg quite rightly explains, "The roll book is the Pentateuch, which from the beginning was written on animal skins. The reason which some have taken against the relation to the Pentateuch from the absence of the article is a quite trivial one, since the article is rarer in poetry, which loves short and concine expression, than in prose, and could be all the more readily absent here, since in Davidic times, where no other sacred book existed, every one knew at once what was to be understood by the Book of Scrolls." 2) And even Franz Delitzsch declares, "The scroll is the Torah rolled up and written on animal skin." 3)

What has just been said of the Psalms is also true of the other poetic books of the Old Testament, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, and the Book of Job. Especially the

1) With "testimony" (XXXX) the law is meant, as the parallelism of this verse and other passages, e.g. 2 Kings 11, 12, show.

2) Commentary on the Psalms. Second Edition II, p. 336 f.

3) Biblical Commentary on the Psalms. Third Edition I, p. 323.

The Proverbs of Solomon contain throughout reflections on and expositions of the divine revelation given in the Law and verified in the special guidance of Israel. If the literal references to specific passages of the Pentateuch in this book and in the other three poetic writings are much rarer than in the book of Psalms and especially in the historical writings, this is, as already noted, due to the very peculiar purpose and character of these books, in which also the manifold wisdom of God is revealed, who spoke to the fathers sometimes and in many ways, 1 Cor. 12, 4. 12, 4. Heb. 1, 1. But let it be noted that the expressions "tree of life" and "way of life" (Prov. 3, 18. 11, 30. and more; 5, 6. 10, 17. and more) evidently refer back to Gen. 3, 24.; that the words of essential, personal wisdom, "The LORD had me in the beginning of his ways," etc. (Prov. 8, 22. ff.), presuppose the creation account, Gen. 1; that the passages Job 5, 14. and 31, 11. allude to Deut. 28:29, and Deut. 18:17, 20:14; and that even the Song of Songs, which had so little occasion to refer to the contents of the Pentateuch, yet recalls by the word "Mahanaim" the angelic hosts which met the arch-father Jacob on his return from Mesopotamia. (Cf. Hohel. 6, 12. with Gen. 32, 1. f. 1)

Much more numerous are the testimonies from the prophetic books of the Old Testament. It would be going too far to list the references to the five books of Moses that are found in them, even in some degree of completeness; but it can be shown that the prophets who were active at various times knew and quoted the Pentateuch, not only those who appeared in the kingdom of Judah, from the first to the last, but also the men of God who were active in the kingdom of Israel, both the exilic and the post-exilic prophets. Only a few passages are mentioned, first of all from the prophets who worked in the kingdom of the two tribes. 2) There is especially Isaiah, who lives and weaves in the law. Right away his great opening speech: "Hear, ye heavens, and earth, take heed; for the Lord speaketh: I have raised up and exalted children, and they have fallen away from me. An ox knoweth his master, and an ass his master's crib: but Israel knoweth it not, and my people hear it not," etc. Is. 1, 2-9. - This whole speech is rooted in the Pentateuch, and almost every verse and almost every expression in the individual verses can be traced in the Pentateuch. (See Deut. 5:32, Deut. 3:26, Deut. 5:28.) Thus Isaiah also mentions the law once and says of the people: "They are a disobedient people and lying children, who will not listen to the law.

1) F. Delitzsch, "Biblischer Commentar über das Hohelied", p. 108.

2) Further evidence can be found in the apologetic works of Hävernick, Hengstenberg, Keil, Rupprecht and others already mentioned. (Cf. May issue of "Lehre und Wehre", p. 134.)

The law of the Lord", Is. 30, 9. And when it says with him Cap. 3, 9. says: "Their nature they have no secret, and boast of their sin, as those of Sodom, and hide it not," even a rationalist like Hitzig has concluded from this, that the history of Sodom, Gen. 19, was before the prophet in writing. 1) Likewise another arch-rationalist, Gesenius, remarks on the passage Cap. 30, 17.: "Your thousand shall flee from a few reproaches, yea, from five ye shall all flee," that the words are "almost literal parallels" to two passages in the Pentateuche, 3 Mos. 26, 8. and 5 Mos. 32, 30.,') after the celebrated interpreter of Isaiah, Vitringa, had already very correctly said: "Criminatio desumpta est ex cantico Mosis." 2) Or let us compare the book of Joel. There we find Cap. 2, 13. the passage, "Rend your hearts, and not your garments; and turn ye to the LORD your God: for he is gracious, and merciful, and patient, and of great kindness, and soon repenteth him of punishment." Will not every one there, even the most simple reader of the Bible, at once hear out the old word of the Torah, which is found in Ex. 34:6: "O LORD God, merciful, and gracious, and patient, and of great mercy and faithfulness?" (Cf. also Ex. 32:14.) Similar proofs can be found in Micah, but also in Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah. (Cf. e.g. Micha 6,4. with 2 Mos. 13, 3. 20,2.; Nah. 1, 2. with 2 Mos. 20, 5. 5 Mos. 4, 24.; Hab. 3, 3. with 5 Mos. 33, 2.; Zeph. 1, 13. with 5 Mos. 28, 30. 39.)

The same is true for the prophets Amos and Hosea who were active in the ten tribes area. The former shows a very exact knowledge of the Pentateuch, which is all the more remarkable since he was from a lower class and not educated in prophetic schools (Cap. 7, 14.).); and in the very beginning of his book he announces judgment to the people because they reject God's law, and says in the name of Jehovah: "For three and four vices I will not spare Judah; because they despise the law of the LORD, and keep not his statutes," Amos 2:4. Hosea, on the other hand, addresses the apostate priesthood thus: "Thou rejectest God's word" (knowledge, "therefore will I reject thee also, that thou shalt not be my priest. Thou forgettest the law of thy God, therefore will I also forget thy children," Cap. 4, 6. This passage supposes that the priesthood had preferentially the duty of dealing with the law, wherefore their greatest fault is said to be a forgetfulness and non-observance of the law. The sin of the people is represented Cap. 6:7. as a breach of covenant, and what the Prophet means by this is shown by the words Cap. 8:1. "They transgress my covenant, and become apostates from my law." But that the prophet has a written

1) Citirt bei Hävernick-Keil, "Specielle Einleitung in den Pentateuch". Second edition, p. 51.

2) Commentarius in Jesaiam. II, p. 207.

The fact that he has the law in mind is shown by the words that follow soon after: "If I write him as many (ten thousands) of my law, it will be regarded as a foreign doctrine", Cap. 8, 12, to which Keil aptly remarks: "The keeping of the written laws" is called "a continuous prescribing of them. These words unmistakably refer to the great multitude of laws recorded in the Mosaic Torah." 1) It is also noteworthy that Hosea, in the 11th and 12th chapters of his book, has so many references and allusions to the prehistory of the people of Israel that every reader free of prejudice must admit that this prophet presupposes the most exact acquaintance with the stories told in the first and second books of Moses among his people, which, however, was only possible if these stories were available in written form. Hosea refers to the Egyptian bondage, the execution from Egypt, the miraculous food in the desert, the downfall of Sodom and Gomorrah, the story of the birth of Jacob and Esau, Jacob's wandering to Mesopotamia, his service for Leah and Rachel, his struggle with God, etc. - Finally, Jonah also knows the Pentateuch, when he writes Cap. 4, 2. like Joel, cites the well-known words from Ex. 34, 6. 32, 14.

Finally, let us take a look at the exilic and post-exilic prophets, although there is really no need for further proof of their relations to the Pentateuch, since these are also generally acknowledged and conceded by modern higher criticism. In Jeremiah, who lived and worked in the last years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and then still afterwards, the references to the five books of Moses, especially to the fifth book, are so numerous that, on the part of higher criticism, the origin of the Pentateuch, or at least of Deuteronomy, has been transferred to the age of this prophet. He punishes the false scribes who said, "We know what is right, and have the holy Scriptures" (the law of the Lord, XXXX XXXX) "before us," Cap. 8, 8. He declares to the people the words of the covenant, and says to them in the words of the law, "Cursed be he that obeyeth not the words of this covenant, which I commanded your fathers in the day that I brought them up out of the land of Egypt, out of the iron furnace, saying, Obey my voice, and do as I have commanded you; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God," Cap. 11, 3. f., cf. with Deut. 27, 26. 4, 20. He refers to the Exodus from Egypt, and recalls the ordinances then given, Cap. 34, 13. f., comp. with Ex. 20, 2. 21, 2., and uses in his sermon against Moab, Cap. 48, 45. f., literally the prophecy 4 Mos. 21, 28. f. - Ezekiel's book, written in exile, shows such an acquaintance with the Pentateuche, especially with its cultus.

1) Biblical Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets. Second edition, p. 83.

The authors of the first part of the Pentateuch, the first part of the third book of Moses, the second part of the third book of Moses, the third part of the third book of Moses, the third part of the third book of Moses, the third part of the third book of Moses, the third part of the third book of the third book of Moses, the third part of the third book of the third book of Moses, the third part of the third book of the third book of Moses, the third part of the third book of the third book of Moses, the third part of the third book of the third book of Moses. 1) Again, it would be going too far to state here Ezekiel's most conspicuous touches with the Pentateuch; they also leap at once into the eyes of every reader, and we refer only to the account of the new temple in the prophet's closing vision, Cap. 40-48, with its numerous references to the Book of Five and deviations from it. In Daniel, the younger contemporary of Ezekiel, we find again the express designation of the law as written by Moses, when the prophet in his prayer to the Lord says: "We have gone astray, and have not obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, that we should walk in his law, which he set before us by his servants the prophets: but all Israel transgressed thy law, and departed from obeying thy voice. Therefore the curse and the oath, which is written in the law of Moses the servant of God, is upon us, because we have sinned against him. And he hath kept his words which he spake against us, and against our judges that should judge us, in that he hath brought upon us such great evil, that there is none like it in all heaven, as there is in Jerusalem. As it is written in the law of Moses, all these great calamities have come upon us," Dan. 9:9 ff. The prophet thus refers to the well-known chapters 3 Mos. 26 and 5 Bios. 28, and we see: he knows a law of God, and that a written one. And this God's Torah is at the same time the Torah of Moses as written. The post-exilic prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, are very zealous about the temple, the law, and the priesthood, as their books show, and thus at the same time acknowledge the Pentateuch. Yes, as if in conclusion, one of them, Malachi, the last prophet of the whole old covenant, on the last leaf of the Old Testament Scriptures, in the third last verse of his book, still presses, as it were, the seal of his authority on all the preceding testimonies, mentions once more the Law and the name of Moses, and calls out to the people admonishingly as the messenger of Jehovah: "Remember the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded him in Horeb unto all Israel, with the commandments and the statutes," Mal. 4, 4. Thereby he presents the revelation of God, which was given more than a millennium ago, to all Israel as a guideline for the present and the future until the time of the Messiah.

1) The historical books of the Old Testament, pp. 81 ff.

Now what does the newer criticism say to these testimonies of the poetic and prophetic books? These passages, too, are dismissed in a similar manner, only more briefly and unsubtly, as the testimonies from the historical books. Let us again hear Strack, who is still considered positive, because it is precisely to him that Cornill, his radical-critical opponent, is credited with having "successfully endeavored to give an objective picture of the state of scientific research, while completely preserving his own theological standpoint." 1) Strack first says of Daniel: "The books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Daniel, because post-exilic, are not to be used without further ado as external testimonies." And then it says about "the testimony of the prophetic and lyric books" thus: "Of all the prophets only Mal. 3, 22. ,the law of MosesB Micah 6, 4. Jer. 15, 1. and Isa. 63, 11. 12. do not come into consideration for the authorship of the Pentateuch. Otherwise Moses is not mentioned in the books of prophetic speech. In the four Psalms in which the name of Moses occurs (77, 99, 105, 106) there is no mention of Moses as a writer." 2) That is all. These short sentences do not need to be refuted after what has been said above. We only want to call attention to the fact that Strack has completely overlooked a passage in the Psalms in which the name of Moses is mentioned, namely the most important of all, the already discussed words: "He has made Moses know his ways, the children of Israel his doings," Ps. 103:7. Such research is not very scientific and exact.

In general, the much-vaunted modern higher criticism often lacks scientificity all too much. We will bring some more evidence to this later, but at the end of this section we want to draw attention to only one point. We have explained how the entire Old Testament, which was written at the most diverse times, by the most diverse persons and under the most diverse circumstances, bears direct or indirect witness to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. We have also shown, and will continue to show later, how the whole of recent criticism rejects these testimonies outright, designates the passages that are inconvenient to it as forgeries, 3) and declares the entire Pentateuch to be spurious, a patchwork of unknown greats of later times, especially for so-called "internal reasons. This, to say nothing of the divine authority of the holy Scriptures, is not a "scientific procedure" either, for sober, sound, reasonable science judges quite differently in such questions. In the fieId of profane literature the procedure is different. The well-known philologist Blaß, admittedly an authority of the first order in the field of classical literature

1) Introduction to the Old Testament. Second edition, p. 12.
2) Introduction to the Old Testament. Fourth edition, p. 25.
3) Cf. May issue of "Lehre und Wehre", p. 138 ff.

In his "Hermeneutics and Criticism," written for classical philologists, the author, who is of the highest rank, deals at length with the "Criticism of the Genuine and the Ungenuine" with respect to the writings attached to an author, and in the section on "External Testimony" says, among other things, the following instructive sentences: "The testimony of the citations and other mentions, which will not be lacking in the vast majority of cases, comes very much into consideration here." Then, after stating that these testimonies are of varying value, he distinguishes several classes of testimonies. "The weightiest foreign testimonies are those from such proximity and personal acquaintance that an error seems impossible: e. g. those of Aristotle on the Platonic writings, or that of the younger Pliny on the works of his uncle. Of course, the author's own testimonies, who often refers to other writings of his, have the highest probative value. ... The case can now be definitively decided in one sense or another by this interrogation of witnesses. For the dialogue of Tacitus, the well-known passage of Pliny seems almost sufficient to prove the case; Plato's laws are completely guaranteed by the Aristotelian testimony. If, however, Zeller earlier believed to prove the inauthenticity of this writing on internal grounds, then one sees from this how bad the internal grounds are in general. There are, however, means of getting rid of the strongest external testimonies - admittedly not permissible means. Schaarschmidt seeks to eliminate the Aristotelian testimonies for some Platonic writings by reversing the causal relation: not because in the writing, therefore in the citation, but because in the citation, therefore in the (forged) writing. But this is a probability of the second kind, which is certainly present under special conditions, but not without them; to reckon with such probabilities at all is rather a matter of sophistry than of science. Thus it is presupposed here that someone wanted to forge in Plato's name; nay, still more, that the forger endeavored to produce the semblance of a genuine writing with all sorts of rags also from other sources, and that he searched for such rags; only thus is it probable that in searching he also came upon this Aristotelian passage. But the premise is the greatest of improbability that can be conceived." 1) Fiat applicatio! These words of a scientific philologist should indeed be a warning sign to those who call themselves with emphasis "scientific theologians" on their wrong ways also in Pentateuch criticism.

L. F.

(To be continued.)

1) v. Müller, "Handbuch der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaften". Second edition, I, p. 290.

Religion in the state schools.

(Conclusion.)

Among all the larger ecclesial communities, we Lutherans stand alone in the consistent separation of church and state. Even the Baptists, for the most part, are no longer consistent with Roger Williams' statements. On March II, for example, the "Sendbote," the paper of the German Baptists, wrote: "Since the Bible is not only the foundation of true religion, but also of all true morality, more attention should be given to it in all schools of the country." At the same time the "Sendbote" expresses its joy that the Bible is now being introduced into the state schools. The Papists, with whom we have often been put together in this piece, are not principled, but only from prudence and temporarily advocates of the separation of church and state. They are indeed against Protestant, but heart and soul for Catholic instruction in the State schools. Of all the larger denominations, it is only the Lutherans who, in accordance with Scripture, reject the toleration of false teachers in the church, but on the other hand, in accordance with Scripture, reason, justice, and American liberty and the Constitution, want nothing to do with religious intolerance, nor even with mere tolerance in the state. In the church, Lutherans recognize only true co-religionists; in the state, however, they concede complete freedom and civil equality to all denominations and religions. Unfortunately, however, even in this play the Lutheran Church in America does not offer a united front to the sects. We have opponents in our own camp. The English part of the General Synod, which is in so many ways a stepping stone to the sects, stands on one and the same platform with the Puritans in the mixing of church and state. And according to the English papers in the General Council, we have few comrades from this side. For this now some more proofs.

On March 13 of this year, the Lutheran Observer wrote: "The present effort to separate religion and even morals from education is a great danger to our nation, and an occasion for the clamor of Rome over our 'godless public schools.'" Of October 3 last, the same paper wrote: "The position that the public schools must be excluded from any part in the religious training of the young we do not believe is well taken." While our government has no right to select a particular sect as the state church ("selecting some one phase of Christianity and supporting it from the public revenues"), it does have the right and duty to profess Christianity as the religion of the American nation and to teach it in its schools. In the same number the "Observer" declares:

In view of the diverse population and the many sects of our country, it is quite good that state and church are separated here. But from this one should not draw the conclusion that the American state has nothing to do with religion. "The claim has been strongly and persistently urged that the State or Nation as such shall not relate itself at all to religion, the principles or laws of Christianity, or the government and favor of God. It fights for the annulment of our Sabbath laws, against the governmental employment of chaplains, the reading of the Scriptures in our public schools, and other forms of acknowledgment of Christianity. It utterly secularizes the education of our State Universities." All this, however, is basically nothing but "audacious practical atheism." For as the individual Christian is bound in all things to the Bible, so is the State, and as such. On November 21, the Observer wrote: "Indeed, the State, as an aggregation of citizens in self-government, may justly be regarded as a 'moral personality,' under the full law of duty, piety, and responsibility."

It is a fact, however, that the State, too, with its officials, has a Lord in heaven to whom it is responsible and with whom no respect of person is valid. But it is also a fact that the state as such, precisely when it does not concern itself with religion, but leaves this to the church, is not merely guided by reason, justice, and the American constitution and liberty, but by God's word. If the State declares that religion is a matter for the Church and not for the State, it is doing what God wants it to do. If, on the other hand, the state practices religion and forces many of its citizens to support with their taxes and votes something they cannot approve of in conscience, it is doing something that is forbidden to it not only by American liberty, but by the Holy Scriptures. But the "Lutheran Observer" concludes quite differently. For, just as every man is bound to be guided in all things by the Scriptures, so also the state has the sacred duty to make everything the law of the state, and to demand of its citizens what the Scriptures demand of man. Just what the persecuting Puritans taught! But it does not follow from the fact that every man is guilty of acting according to the Scriptures that the state has a duty to enforce the Bible. Christians have a duty under the Scriptures to spread the gospel throughout the world. But it does not follow that the state as such has this duty, nor even that it must urge its citizens to fulfill this duty. The conclusion from the duties of individuals to the duties and rights of the state is a false conclusion. It is disregarded that the State is a "persona communis," which as such (for what may otherwise be conferred upon it under certain circumstances is not here spoken of) only exists and, according to God's will, only has the right to do so.

The government is supposed to exist for a very specific purpose (the maintenance of civil peace and order). God will therefore also hold the authorities as such responsible only for achieving this purpose without doing wrong themselves. The "Observer" elevates the πρώτα" ψ^δος of all religious intolerance, namely, that God holds the state responsible for the true piety and religiosity of its citizens, to the axiom of its doctrine of the relation of the state to the church.

That the American state has the right and duty to teach Christianity in its schools, the "Lutheran Observer" further seeks to prove with the fact that our state with its freedom has its origin, support and existence in Christianity alone. Without Christianity there would be no freedom in America, and without it it would not remain with us. Gratitude, self-interest and the state's duty of self-preservation therefore imperatively demanded the introduction of religious instruction in the state schools. Of October 3, the Observer wrote: "Can the State afford an education of its citizens that drops out Christian ethics, and the only vital inspiration to the practice of Christian ethics, the Christian religion?" "The demand, therefore, that the State repudiate all recognition of Christianity and forbid the use of the Bible in the public schools because these are maintained by the public revenues, is to demand that it turn its back on the source of its being and disown the only guarantee of its own perpetuity." And from 28 (November: "The elimination of the Bible from our system of popular education would seem to be suicidal."

The fact is, here again, that the real fontes of American liberty lie in Christianity. Of course, this does not apply without restriction to Puritan Christianity. Why? Because it deviates from Scripture in its doctrine of state and church and the relationship of the two to one another, and confuses the spiritual and the secular, Christ's kingdom and the emperor's kingdom, in an unchristian manner. But this is true of the Christianity of the Lutheran Reformation, which, according to Scripture, neatly separates state and church, spiritual and civil liberty, and seeks to produce faith, piety, and good works not by coercion and state laws, but by the gospel alone. In this Christianity, however, the American State has its lowest foundation and surest support. But when the "Observer" draws from this fact the conclusion that the state must teach the Christian religion in its schools, it is demanding precisely that which Christianity rejects as harmful and corrupt to both state and church. Christianity wants the state and the church to remain separate, and it is to this teaching that we owe American liberty. Out of gratitude for this and concern for the welfare of the state, the "Observer" now wants to separate state and church.

The Church and the Christian religion into the state schools, thus destroying the very thing we owe to Christianity! What confusion in the minds of the General Synod!

The Lutheran Observer, in discussing the question of whether the state had a right and duty to teach religion in its schools, places particular emphasis on the assertion that America was a Christian nation and that Christianity was a part of our national law. He writes: "In any just consideration of the right and propriety of the use of the Bible in the public schools (as recognition of the Christian religion in public schools) it must be borne in mind that 'we are a Christian nation by the will of God and also by the will of man,' . . . Christianity is a part of the law of the land." Thus it is now often argued: "We are a Christian nation, and Christianity is a part of the law of our land. How unnatural, therefore, it is to exclude Christian religious instruction from the state schools!" - But what does this mean, "America is a Christian nation"? Is it that all American citizens are Christians? Hardly! In the city of New York alone, for example, there are over 650,000 Jews! And the number of the churchless, the Unitarians, and other manifest heathens there will rather be greater than less. - Or does the above sentence mean to say that the Constitution of the United States declares the American people to be Christian, and only tolerates the adherents of other religions, or of no religion at all, or regards them only as second-class citizens? In the Federal Constitution and in the Constitutions of the individual States, the exact opposite is said of all this. - If, however, the "Observer," in saying that "America is a Christian country," means only that there are many pious Christians in America, and many churches in which the Gospel is preached, we believe this also, and have nothing against it, if one speaks of America as a Christian country in this or a similar sense. But does it follow that the American state must give advantages to Christians and instruct the children in the country in the Christian religion? Does it follow that in the city of New York, more than three times 650,000 Jews, un-Christians, and Papists, must be taxed to teach the Christian religion to the children of Protestants, and to turn the children of Jews away from the Talmud? Even if all the citizens of our country belonged to Christian denominations, it would still not follow that the State should now be allowed to practice religion in its schools. If the State were to single out for this purpose the teachings of a particular denomination, all the rest would protest. And if the State were to establish a religion of its own for its schools, all communities in which there was still any religious fidelity at all would have to protest. Yes, even if all the citizens of our country were vain Christians, the principle would remain the-

still stand: State and church, spiritual and secular, shall not be mixed. 1)

When then the "Observer" declares: "Christianity is a part of the law of the land", with which the state has to make its citizens familiar, we ask again: What does that mean? Does it mean that the State opens the Bible in its courts and decides according to the words of Scripture whether a person is liable to civil punishment or not? Of course, that is how it was with the Puritans. Whoever committed an offense against the Bible had also violated the law of the state, had become liable to civil punishment, and was treated as a state criminal. In the American courts, however, the statutes of the state decide, and a sentence from the Bible may not influence the judge in his judgment any more than a sentence from the Koran or the Talmud. - Perhaps, however, the above sentence is intended to say that the laws of our state are in harmony with the moral demands contained in Scripture. But this, too, is evidently not the case. The Bible contains many laws that are not found in American statutes, and vice versa. Yes, American statutes contain many laws that permit what Scripture forbids and forbid what Scripture exempts. Just think of the marriage and divorce laws! Of the 320,000 American divorces in the last twenty years, how many does Scripture approve? If the criterion of the Christianity of a state consisted in the fact that its laws nowhere conflicted with the laws of the Bible, then one would have to deny the American state the predicate "Christian. - But does the "Observer" mean by his sentence that in America there are many people who are

1) If the representatives of the people in Washington or in any state legislature wanted to declare in the name of their electorate: "We are a Christian nation, a Christian state", this would be an untruth. According to the truth, the representatives of the people could only declare, "A portion of the citizens who elected us here profess Christianity." If, therefore, the C. R. A., for example, demands of our representatives in Washington that they resolve: "The people whom we represent are Christians; we are a Christian nation," it is thereby imputing to them something immoral. The representatives of the people in the legislatures may declare for their persons, "We are Christians; we believe in the Triune God." But if they should decide, "The people who elected us believe in the triune God," this would be both untrue and unjust. As untrue and unjust, indeed, as if a legislature, which happened to be composed entirely of Papists, were to declare, "The people we represent are Papists; we are a Catholic nation." If the representatives of the people are presented with the question whether the nation they represent is Christian or not, they must, if they do not wish to act immorally, refuse to vote, because the question cannot be answered in the affirmative or in the negative. And if this happens, if the legislature refuses to declare our nation a Christian one, it is not unchristian, but rightly done. Christianity demands that representatives of the people give honor to the truth when voting.

If there are those who earnestly endeavor to arrange their lives according to the Bible, this is certainly true. But if it follows that the public school must teach the Christian religion, what does it follow that the great majority in our country do not follow the Bible? - True also is this, that there is a moral spirit in the American laws. And this is what the "Observer" has in mind when he speaks of Christianity in our national law. But this is true of all legal codes, from the Hammurabic Code down to the statutes of the most recent state, although not of all of them to the same degree. He who therefore calls the American State Christian, because justice and morality are manifested in its laws, must after all call every State Christian. For the same reason, one could also call the American state Aristotelian. "Nam Aristotle" - so writes the Apology - "de moribus civilibus adeo scripsit erudite, nihil ut de his requirendum sit amplius." The natural law which God has written in the heart of man coincides precisely with the moral law in the Decalogue. The "Lutheran Observer" commits the error, unpardonable in the Lutheran Church, of confusing law and gospel, Christianity and morality, as will be seen more clearly from what follows.

If the state schools are to teach Christian religion, the difficult question arises: Which religion should be chosen, that of the Unitarians, the Papists, the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians or the Lutherans? But even this crux does not trouble the "Observer" because of its syncretism and indifferentism. He writes: "There is an immense field of theistic and Christian truth that is common to all who assume to call themselves Christian in their sentiments and beliefs, and these persons constitute all but an infinitesimal part of our population." 1) In the state schools, according to the "Observer", all those religious

1) Like the "**Observer**", the "Congregationalist" also seems to think of the matter. On April 4 he writes: Religion is essentially ethics, "ethics with divine sanction". The question, he says, is only whether it can be agreed that children in the public schools should be shown their duties to their neighbors and their responsibilities to God. The great majority of our people are united in the essentials of religion: the universal fatherhood of God and brotherhood of all men, the dignity of human life and the moral order of the world. Essentially, religion is nothing other than faith in God, immortality, and human freedom and responsibility. In the same number the proposal is then made that a committee should meet, consisting of Jews, Catholics and Protestants, "to formulate an irreducible minimum of theistic belief and altruistic ethic". Thereby it would turn out that people were much closer to each other than they had believed. It is necessary to destroy the illusion that we are far apart from each other.

The Observer has not told us what these propositions are. What these propositions are, the Observer has not revealed. . . Perhaps for the reason that he knows none. The fact is that the Observer could not name a single specifically Christian doctrine that was not disputed by hundreds of thousands of American citizens. And what the "Lutheran Observer" cannot do will be beyond the powers of even a school superintendent or a legislature. By what method, by the way, should the pieces on which all Americans agree, with infinitesimal exceptions, be ascertained? By deduction from the federal Constitution? That would lead to nothing, for in it even the name of God and Christ is missing. By inductive search of all citizens? Apparently not to be done. So by a decree of the legislature?! In any case, even if the "Lutheran Observer" had deleted everything in which all who call themselves Christians differ from one another, not much more would remain than a few meager sentences of morality. And this remainder the "Observer" dares to call Christianity, which the denominations continue to form according to their own peculiarities, and which therefore the State can also teach without coming into conflict with the Christian communities. "Surely," says the Observer, "it is not sectarian to permit the teaching of that which belongs to all the sects and which is part of our common Christianity. It is said that reading from the Bible in schools, although unaccompanied by any comment, is sectarian instruction. Clearly this is an untenable position, unless it be contended that Christianity itself, and not merely the various types of Christianity as represented by different organized bodies of Christians, is a sect." In the State schools "common Christianity" should be taught, not "seotarian." According to the Observer, this is the solution to the problem. 1)

But just here the "Observer" betrays that he not only has confused concepts of state and church and the relationship of both to each other, but that temporarily he himself has lost the right conception of the essence of Christianity, like so many who have recently written about the introduction of the Christian religion into the state schools. Who can still call that Christianity (undeveloped Christianity), what remains of the Bible, after all sects, from the Papists down to the Unitarians, have deleted everything that does not suit them,

1) With the same argument one tried to make the new school law acceptable to the Dissenters in England. Canon Moberly, however, showed that there was no such thing as undenominationalism. Unsectarianism was based on the false premise "that there is a real essence of Christianity which is capable of being detached alike from all specific forms of dogmatic conviction".

who obviously does not know what Christianity is. The main question of all religions is: How does man become just and blessed before God? This question cannot be skipped in religious instruction. Christianity, too, is essentially nothing but an answer, the only correct answer, to this question: How does man become just and blessed before God? This is the actual scopus of the whole sacred Scripture. Now what answer is the teacher of religion in the state schools to give to this question? As soon as he opens his mouth to answer this question of all questions, either the Lutherans and all who agree with them will protest, or the Papists, Unitarians, and all who are of one mind with them. Does not the "Observer" see that in the same way, in the main question common to all religions and denominations, concerning the forgiveness of sins, righteousness before God, and the attainment of blessedness, not only Christians, Jews, and heathen, but also Papists, Lutherans, and other Protestant communities, oppose each other like yes and no? Does the teacher of religion in the state school want to answer the question: How is man justified before God? he has only ONE choice: he must either pronounce himself in favor of the Lutheran and against the Papist doctrine, or vice versa. There is no middle answer here. It is quite similar with other questions which no religious instruction may avoid, and which, nevertheless, can only be answered in the affirmative or in the negative, e. g.: Is the Bible infallible in its statements? Is God triune? Is Christ the true God? Did he rise from the dead? In short, the Observer's "common Christianity" plan is as utopian as it is un-Christian.

Finally, in support of his claim that the American state has the right and duty to teach the Christian religion in the state schools, the Observer points to the facts that the state hires chaplains, requires an oath in the courts, and so on. He writes: "As a matter of fact both the National and State Governments have from the beginning employed and paid, from the public revenues, Christian ministers as chaplains in Congress and State Legislatures, in the army and navy, in prisons, reformatories, etc.". If the introduction of religious services into those spheres of government activity is not inconsistent with the Constitution, on what principle is the recognition of the Christian religion in public schools declared to be in conflict with our fundamental law?" "Church and State, thank God, are not separated in any way that makes the State either atheistic or agnostic or anything but Christian. It recognizes religion and it recognizes Christianity in its chaplains, and in its courts of law, it makes the insignia of the army chaplain the cross, and the church pennant of the navy also bears a cross. The Japanese was right in his conclusion (from the prayer in Congress) that

this nation is officially Christian." In the same interest the "Lutheran" of the Conciliar points to Sunday, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, Easter, and to the inscription on our silver dollar: "In God we trust." - How these and similar phenomena, which do not all belong to the same category, are to be explained, we will not go into now. This much, however, is certain, that one may not bring into the field against the clear wording of the Constitution some inconsequences, or anomalies, or fossils from the state-church period of our country. But this is what happens when one draws from them the conclusion that the State is justified in teaching a State religion in the schools. If such a conclusion were justified, it might with equal right be inferred that the American State is papist because it employs Catholic chaplains and Cardinal Gibbons as the first worshipper at the dedication of the World's Fair buildings at St. Louis; that it is Methodist because it uses Methodists as chaplains and prayer leaders; pagan because it uses Unitarians; Jewish because, for example, it has Rabbi Harrison give the benediction at the dedication in St. Louis; and Masonic because it occasionally uses Masons for the same purposes. In Washington, some months ago, the corner-stone of the new War Academy was laid. This ceremony was attended by the highest dignitaries of the nation. The laying of the foundation stone was performed by the Grand Master of the Masonic Lodge of the District of Columbia with Masonic ceremonies. A political newspaper remarked: "Thus is this Masonry, so to speak, elevated to the American state religion." According to the rules of the Observer, it would be easy to prove that the "official religion of our country" is Christian, Jewish, Unitarian, Masonic, Papist, Methodist, Lutheran, Episcopalian and Baptist at the same time. From this, then, according to the Observer, it would have to be further concluded that the State had a right and a duty to teach at the same time the Christian, Jewish, Unitarian, Masonic, and Papist religions in its schools. But what really follows is this, that such a conclusion is a hopeless one.

Like the Observer, English papers are also arguing in the General Convention. "The Lutheran Church Review, in its October number, says: "The assertion that the State school must be without religion does injustice to the American people, is contrary to its history, its precedents, and its laws, and is downright dangerous if it is made without qualification. If the state is not allowed to teach religion in its schools, then the oath must also fall in the courts. Let our country also take into account the birthday of Christ, the day of the resurrection, the day of thanksgiving, and Sunday, and let it be read on our state documents: "In the year of the Lord." In its November 20 issue, The Lutheran quotes from the Church Review: "Lutherans who maintain that the State in America is a secular

neutral are not good and true Americans, in the best sense, and are helping the cause and the contention of infidels, Jews, secularists and unbelievers. America is a Christian nation. . . . . Where it is completely secular in education, it is so not because of its lack of historical and actual right to teach Christianity (apart from ecclesiastical influences)" etc. On February 26, the "Lutheran" wrote: "For years we have advocated in our columns that the State owes it to itself and to its future citizens to see to it that moral and even religious instruction is offered to the pupils in the public schools." And of March 5: "No one wants to know anything about 'sectarian instruction' in the public schools; but the Bible is an edification book of acknowledged highest standing, and as such it deserves a place in the public schools of the country. If it is good enough on which to build our civilization and liberty, it is good enough and harmless enough to serve as the basis of a quarter of an hour's devotion in the schools."

These passages sufficiently show that even in the General Council there is a lack of clear recognition of the difference between state and church. The "Lutheran" and the "Lutheran Church Review" indulge in the delusion that they themselves have grasped this part of the doctrine more clearly than Luther. In the number of November 13, the "Lutheran" writes: "If Luther were living to-day in our land, he would modify very largely his conceptions both of Church and State, in their relation to each other." And in the "Lutheran Church Review" Luther is declared to be a representative of the cujus regio - state. In America, too, Luther is often lumped together with Calvin, Knox, Cotton, Mather and Hooker, 1) and Roger Williams and the Anabaptists are presented as the first representatives of the doctrine of the complete separation of church and state. 2) The fact is, however, that Luther lived more than a hundred years

1) "The American Church History Series," II, p. 78: "While we must accord all honor to Roger Williams for advocating liberty of conscience in all its length and breadth at a time when he was almost alone among men of his class and condition in grasping this fundamental Gospel principle, we must beware of looking with contempt on men like Cotton and Mather and Hooker and Winthrop for following *Luther and Melanchthon* and Calvin and Knox, of the Reformation time, and the great contemporary theologians of Europe, in regarding the doctrine of liberty of conscience as utterly impracticable and as certain to result in civil and religious anarchy."

2) Roger Williams writes in "Bloody Tenent of Persecution": "All civil states with their officers of justice, in their respective constitutions and administrations, are . . . *essentially civil,* and therefore not judges, governors, or defenders of the Spiritual, or Christian, State and worship. ... It is the will and command of God that, since the coming of His Son, the Lord Jesus, a permission of the most Paganish, Jewish, Turkish, or anti-Christian con-.

before Roger Williams neatly distinguished between state and church. In 1523 Luther wrote: "Secular authority shall let believe otherwise or so as one can and will, and no one shall force by violence." (Walch. X, 455.) In 1525 he wrote: "Oberkeit shall not resist,

sciences and worship be granted to all men, in all nations and countries; and they are only to be fought against with that sword which is only, in Soul matters able to conquer, to wit: the sword of the Spirit-the Word of God. . . . God requireth not an uniformity of religion to be enacted and enforced in any civil state; which enforced uniformity, sooner or later, is the greatest occasion of civil war, ravishing consciences, persecution of Christ Jesus in His servants, and of the hypocrisy and destruction of millions of souls. ... An enforced uniformity of religion throughout a nation or civil state confounds the civil and religious, denies the principles of Christianity and civility, and that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." (Cobb, p. 12.) - "There goes many a ship to sea, with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common; and is a true picture of a commonwealth, or a human combination, or society. It hath fallen out sometimes that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked into one ship. Upon which supposal I affirm that all the liberty of conscience that ever I pleaded for turns upon these two hinges: that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews, or Turks be forced to come to the ship's prayers or worship; nor compelled from their own particular prayers or worship, if they practice any. I further add that I never denied that notwithstanding this liberty the commander of the ship ought to command the ship's course; yea, and also command that justice, peace, and sobriety be kept and practiced, both among the seamen and all the passengers. If any of the seamen refuse to perform their service, or passengers to pay their freight; if any refuse to help in person or purse towards the common charges or defence; if any refuse to obey the common laws and orders of the ship, concerning their common peace or preservation; if any shall mutiny and rise up against their commanders and officers; if any should preach or write that there ought to be no commanders nor officers because all are equal in Christ, therefore no masters nor officers, no laws nor orders, no corrections nor punishments - I say: I never denied but in such cases, whatever is pretended, the commander or commanders may judge, resist, compel, and punish such transgressors, according to their deserts and merits." ("The American Church History Series," II, p. 77.) Before Roger Williams, in England, the Baptists Smyth and Helwys had emphasized the same thing. Smyth wrote in 1611: "That the magistrate is not by virtue of his office to meddle with religion or matters of conscience, to force or compel men to this or that form of religion or doctrine, but to leave Christian religion free to every man's conscience, and to handle only civil transgressions (Rom. 13), injuries, and wrongs of man against man, in murder, adultery, theft, etc., for Christ only is the king and lawgiver of the church and conscience (James 4, 12)." And Helwys taught, "The king is a mortal man and not God, therefore hath no power over the immortal souls of his subjects, to make laws and ordinances for them, and to set spiritual laws over them. If the king have authority to make spiritual lords and laws, then he is an immortal God and not a mortal man." (L. c.., p. 44.)

what anyone wants to teach and believe, be it gospel or lies; is enough that they ward off sedition and discord." (XIV, 64.) In 1528 Luther declared that the appointment of ecclesiastical officials was not decided in the duty of the secular authorities. (X, 1905.) In 1529: "The emperor's sword has nothing to do with faith; it belongs in bodily, secular matters, lest God should be angry with us if we misjudge his order." (XX, 2665.) In a letter of 1530, Luther declared, "Princely office does not stretch itself to ward off such things (the angle mass)." In another letter of the same year Luther declared that one should rather die than admit that the "episcopus ut princeps," that is, by virtue of his temporal power, could command the church to do anything. Until his death Luther protested against interventions of the secular authorities in spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs. In a letter of 1543 Luther wrote of the consistories: "Desinant vocationes confundere, suas aulas curent, ecclesias relinquant his, qui ad eas vocati sunt. Distincta volumus officia ecclesiae et aulae. Satan pergit esse satan. Sub papa miscuit ecclesiam politiae, sub nostro tempore vult miscere politiam ecclesiae." And in his Table Talks Luther is said to have declared, "We must tear up the consistories." What Luther teaches in these and similar passages, the "Ev.-Luth. Gemeinde-Blatt" summarizes quite correctly thus: "Church and State are two quite different regiments, which also should not be mixed with each other. The church has the right and power to judge doctrine and to appoint teachers and to govern itself. In secular matters the sovereign has power, even over Christians. Princes and authorities, if they are believers, are in the church, are even distinguished members of it, and therefore they take part in the appointment of teachers (preachers) and otherwise in the leadership and promotion of the church. But all this only as members of the church, not because of their high secular position, not because they are princes, sovereigns. The power of the emperor and the princes as such has nothing to do with the church. Thus it is not for the prince to confirm the true doctrine, that is, to determine what shall be considered true doctrine. The princes are to leave the church to those who are called to it. The courts (princes) would have no calling to govern the church. But Luther always feared that they would like to do so. For the devil would always want to mix the state with the church, as the devil's tool, the antichrist, the pope, mixes the church with the state. Such fears of Luther's proved to be well founded even during his lifetime, since in the consistories, where the church was represented by theologians and the state by lawyers, the state and the authorities wanted to exercise church rule through the lawyers. Luther then says: 'We must tear up the consistory, for in short we do not want the lawyers and the pope in it (in the governing consistories).'"

The same doctrine is found in the Augustana, which writes in the 16th article: "For the gospel teaches not an outward, temporal, but an inward, eternal nature and righteousness of the heart, and does not prevent worldly government, police, and marriage. Further in the 28th article: "Because the power of the churches or bishops gives eternal goods, and is exercised and driven only by the ministry of preaching, the police and the worldly government hinder them nothing everywhere. Then the secular government deals with many other things than the gospel; which authority does not protect souls, but body and goods against outward violence with the sword and bodily sounds." (Müller, p. 63.) What the Augustana teaches, Plitt thus summarizes: "From the beginning of the world it (the temporal authority) has its right. It is a benefit of God, by which he restrains sin, restrains or punishes its outbreaks, protects men in their coexistence. But with this are also given the limits of her profession. It has a purely external government; it has nothing to do with the soul; if it presumes to govern it, it exceeds its powers; for this God alone has reserved to himself to do; he alone can and will make pious; he does it by his word, for the proclamation of which he has appointed the office of preaching, the spiritual government." ("Introduction to the Augustana," II, p. 406.)

F. B.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Statue of Luther in front of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis. On June **14, the statue of Luther,** donated by the "Luther-Walther Monument Society," was unveiled in St. Louis before a large crowd. On January 28, 1883, a number of young men in St. Louis decided to erect a monument to Luther in front of Concordia Seminary, and on February 11, 40 members organized themselves as the "Luther Memorial Society." After Dr. Walther's death the society decided to erect a statue to him in front of the Concordia Seminary in St. Louis. The first purpose has been accomplished, and handsome contributions have already been drawn for the latter. - If the "Luther-Walther-Memorial Society" had been able to ask Luther himself where he wanted to stand, he would undoubtedly have passed by the great universities of Germany: Berlin, Wittenberg-Halle, Jena, Leipzig, Erlangen, Dorpat, Kiel, etc., since they have all fallen away from Luther's theology in principle as well as in their individual teachings, and, turning his gaze toward America, he would have declared: Before the Concordia Seminary in the Synodal Conference I will stand, for here not only are my writings printed and eagerly read, but here also one faithfully adheres to the confession of the Lutheran Church and to all its doctrines. And if Luther had been asked again which of the theologians of the nineteenth century he would choose to stand by his side, he would have chosen the modern "scientific" theologians of Germany, who have the name of being pillars of the church:

Schleiermacher, Hofmann, Frank, Kahnis, Ritschl, and others, and pointed to Walther, who had penetrated fine minds like no other and held fast to his theology. If, at last, the American people should raise the question: who of the great men of Europe first stood up for religious liberty and freedom of conscience, the most exquisite jewel in American liberty, they would search in vain among the famous regents, ministers, politicians, poets, and philosophers of Europe, and finally, whether reading forward or backward through the history of Europe, they would have to stop at Luther as the man who stands unique, not only in the sixteenth century, but in the whole history of Europe. Finally, every time we read the history of Europe backwards or forwards, we should stop at Luther as the man who stands uniquely, not only in the sixteenth century, but in the whole history of Europe, precisely as the representative of the separation of church and state and of religious freedom and equality for all citizens. May Luther's theology in the church and freedom in the state remain the jewel in our crown, aere perennius regalique situ pyramidum altius.

F.B.

The Pennsylvania Synod held its 156th annual meeting in Philadelphia in early June. This synod was founded in 1748 and now numbers 360 pastors, 535 congregations and 124,025 confirmed members. In the reports of the institutions, there was complaint of diminution of students in college and seminary. Ten candidates were recommended to Synod for ordination. Much time was spent on the question of how to deal with a student whom the professors had graduated at Mount Airy, but of whom the Examination Committee declared that no one had taken such a sad examination for twenty years. On Friday evening the school question was to be discussed. The attendance, however, was small. Father Loos explained that the parochial schools could not be introduced because they reminded people too much of the Catholic schools and because children from the parochial schools would later have to start again several grades lower in English state schools. Against this he recommended the kindergarten, Fr. Wischan and others advocated parochial schools. No decision was taken. Last year, under the heading of "parochial schools," the Pennsylvania Synod gave 24 schools and 47 teachers. Of these, however, according to the Reading "church bulletin," most are Saturday schools only. The proposition that in future each pastor report accurately what kind of school he had was voted down. In other respects, too, the school reports from the General Council are dull. One hears almost only of the decline of the parochial school and of interest in it. How the question of religious education is treated in English Conferences can be seen from the following report in the "Church Gazette of Reading: "Parochial Schools. This subject was discussed by the English Lutheran Philadelphia Conference at St. Mark's Church, Rev. Dr. Laird, April 14. It was proposed that the State should allow one hour daily for pupils in the public schools to receive instruction in a parochial school. The majority of the pastors were opposed. U. E. R. Cassidy said, "The Church has no right to demand any time from the State's educational work. I send my children to school to be educated and not to be taught religion. That teaching I take care of myself at home, which, I think, is the duty of all parents. Impress parents with the importance of religious teachings in the homes and don't interfere with the children's school hours. Gather in the parents and you will get the bhildren, too.' Prof. Fry was opposed to afternoon hours being set aside for such parochial schools, because the children in the public schools were already too overloaded with work. Fr. Drach suggested that the parochial schools were not suitable here: Resolved, That the parochial school is not adapted to Amer-.

lean environments.' Then a pastor shouted, 'Hail Columbia!' The chairman, Father Hoffman, emphasized that the conference made no resolutions, but only discussed the issues." Complaints were made by the lay delegates about the many time-consuming ministerial meetings at Synod, and several motions were made to abolish them or to amend the Constitution so that laymen could also attend these meetings. From the report of the Deaconess Institution in Philadelphia it appeared that this institution at present numbers 75 sisters, of whom 45 are active in hospitals, 6 in schools, 1 in kindergarten, 5 in congregations and 2 in old people's homes. Dr. Jacobs explained how the Conciliar mission to the heathen in India had been demoralized and had declined, but that at present there were five new missionaries in the field. Father Wendel was accused and found guilty of various heresies and of practicing the art of healing. The Synod decided that he should not perform any official duties for three months and that he should send a written retraction to the President; if not, he should be removed from office. That a synod may exclude from synodical fellowship, but cannot remove from the preaching office without interference with congregational rights, the Pennsylvania Synod still has not learned! Father Wischan proposed that the Conferences be recommended to discuss the doctrine of Sunday, since some English pastors taught falsely on this point, and even that the Methodist preacher Mutchler had been placed in Lutheran pulpits to teach Lutherans about the Sabbath. But the motion was rejected by a large majority. Doctrinal hearings were not held this time either. The "Lutherische Kirchenblatt" of June 13, from which we have taken the above information, remarks: "No doctrinal negotiations took place. That is a pity! No man, pastor or layman, was strengthened in the confession." -Following on from this, we also report that the 33 English Lutheran churches of the Philadelphia Council have decided to advertise in the newspapers, and have appointed "a press representative" to this end. The Lutheran writes: "A church that is not known in a great community like this is a church that is not felt; but let us be concerned that the right things about us may become known." Apart from false reports, which may cause great annoyance, the danger remains twofold: 1. that the preachers, precisely because they are thinking of the newspaper, will allow themselves to be misled as to the standpoint and purpose of each individual sermon, namely, to edify the particular congregation entrusted to them, and not to speak for the public in general; 2. that the total impression of the recorded sermons will be that even the Lutheran preachers are essentially moralists, instead of preachers of the Gospel. F. B.

Separation of the Augustana Synod from the General Council. The Minnesota Conference of the Augustana Synod held its meeting in Minneapolis in May. The conference was attended by 125 pastors and many lay delegates. The Lutheran Herald of June 6 reported, "Of special importance was the question of moving Gustav Adolf College from St. Peter to Minneapolis. A motion was made last year to raise $250,000 before the transfer of the institution would be made. There is now about $113,000 available, so the conference decided to leave the question for a year. .. . The language question caused much excitement in the conference. The Swedes had hitherto resisted English quite vigorously; now, however, they want to introduce English themselves. At this meeting it was also decided, after long heated debates, to request the Conference in the Synod to separate from the General Council. About this decision a pastor of the Augustana writes

Synod: 'We hope that the Synod will well consider this step. It is probable that a large majority of the Western delegates will strongly influence the Synod in this movement.'" - The Augustana Synod meets at Paxton, III F. B., July 11.

From the General Synod and General Council. The extent to which General Synod goes in church fellowship is shown by the following advertisement in the "Iowa City Daily News:" "Owing to the illness of D. Johnson, of the English Lutheran Church, the Baptist and English Lutheran congregations will hold joint services, mornings in the Baptist Church and evenings in the Lutheran Church. Rev. Wheeler will preach the sermons." Such and similar excesses are not merely aberrations in practice, but are the outgrowth of the principal position of the General Synod. How far the same extends the church and prayer fellowship is evident from the following passage in the "Lutheran Observer": "When, at the great Parliament of Religions in Chicago, men of all beliefs united in the Lord's Prayer, who shall say that they had no right to do it, even though it was not with full understanding of its meaning? God is the All-Father. All men are His children." According to this, the General Synods have no hesitation in entering into prayer fellowship even with Buddhists, Brahmins, Shintoists, "Muhammedans" and Unitarians. In the lodges, which are not only tolerated by the General Synod, but downright favored and defended, the same thing happens. Recently even the "Lutheran World," which represents the extreme right in the General Synod, brought the following news without any comment: "Rev. Eli Miller, of St. Mark's Church, Allegheny, Pa. O. O. F. in his church on 'We Be Brethren.'" Against the Ohio Synod the "Lutheran World" has repeatedly made the accusation that while it fights against the lodges in its papers, it lets them have their way in its congregations. For example, in the February 26 issue: "The point, brethren, is the inconsistency existing in the Ohio Synod on the lodge question. Make a little induction into the facts. To be entirely specific, for example, inquire how many lodge men are tolerated in the Martin Luther Church of Canton, 0., in the large congregation at Bucyrus, O." However this may be, the difference remains that on the one side lodges are fought, on the other they are defended. In the General Council, too, the Lodge position has shown more decline than progress. In the April number of the "Lutheran Okurek Revier" Carl Swensson writes of the Augustana Synod: "Let the Lutheran Church hold fast to the faith of the fathers, but add no new fads of modern inventions. I believe the entire stand taken by, for instance, our Augustana Synod on the secret society question has been a mistake and a misfortune. Society members, inside or outside of the Church, should be treated just as any other people. To make special laws and regulations for them, which regulations, in the very nature of the case, cannot be upheld either in letter or in spirit under existing conditions, seems to me to be un-American and un-Lutheran as well as absolutely impracticable. Personally, I feel that the entire fabric of secret, oath-bound organizations maybe a menace not only to the Church, but also to a free government, though not necessarily so. Yet, it must be easier to cure the malady, if such it must be called, with the patient in the hospital than on the street. The Word of God is the true enlightener. If God's Word cannot convince, human regulations will certainly fail to do so, and our ambition, our entire program of head and heart, must be to save as many as possible. The Lutheran Church in America must become more fully

Americanized during the next fifty years." (p. 306 f.) How does this logos of the "Lutheran Church Review" differ from that of the General Synod? F. B.

Negative criticism in General Synod. Of June 4, the "Lutheran" reports that R. Delk of Philadelphia, according to the daily press, appeared before the alumni of the theological seminary at Gettysburg toward the end of May as a champion of higher and highest criticism, and at the same time referred to Dr. Haupt and Briggs, who, without prejudice to their faith, had engaged in critical theological science. On this the "Lutheran" remarks: "If the papers have reported the matter correctly, the Lutheran Church has come to the point where she is obliged to see the sad spectacle of an outspoken defense of bold rationalism in the very central theological seat of the General Synod Lutheranism. ... We confidently look for an official protest against such teaching on the part of the General Synod." Within the Council and the General Synod, the assertion has been repeatedly made in the past year that there are no negative critics in the American Lutheran Church. Now, however, the "Lutheran's" eyes seem to be opening. But what Father Delk presented at Gettysburg is already found in the "Lutheran Quarterly," XXXII, p. 148. There R. Delk openly professes higher Bible criticism, and a retraction has not been made to date. (See "L. u. W." 48, p. 136.) In a letter to the "Lutheran," June 18, R. Delk, while complaining of slander and "wild heresy-hunting," does not in plain words renounce the negative criticism, but rather declares anew that he does not regard the higher criticism of Dr. Briggs and Prof. Haupts as rationalism. He writes: "Any student who has read any number of books upon Biblical Criticism, written within the past twenty-five years, must be aware that the questions of Historical Criticism are both vital and permanent problems in every student's theological thinking. I fear the writer of the article is really ignorant of the discipline known in up-to-date theological seminaries as the Higher Criticism. I am forced to think so by the use he makes of the word Rationalism in connection with Dr. Briggs and Prof. Haupt. He should know that the word Rationalism is a technical term in theologic sciences, but he evidently confuses it with rationality. The Bible and our Confession do not ask man to throw away reason in the reception of truth and in the judgment of the theological problems. Rationalism leaves no place for a supernatural revelation, but the very work of the Higher Criticism is to make clear the real message of God to man." In the same number the "Lutheran" declares that from a private conversation on this matter with R. Delk it emerged: 1. that P. Delk had, however, spoken of Dr. Haupt and Dr. Briggs "as men whose faith had been undisturbed by the pursuit of critical theological science"; 2. that P. Delk, while not agreeing with the most radical conclusions of the two critics mentioned, held that their faith had remained intact and was not rationalistic; 3. that R. Delk believes that he can hold to the Augustana in his critical position; 4. that, however, the "Lutheran" is of the opinion that R. Delk's position consequently also abrogates fundamental doctrines of the Augustana.

F. B.

The bicentenary of Wesley's birth will be celebrated this month in England and America. Wesley was born June 28 (0. 8. the 17th), 1703, and died March 2, 1791. After his return from Georgia until his death he preached no less than 42,400 sermons, aver-

fifteen a week. When Wesley died there were 294 preachers and 71,688 members of the Methodist community in Europe, and 217 preachers and 48,565 members in America. Now the Methodists in the world claim about 8,000,000 members and 20,000,000 adherents. From all appearances the jubilee celebration, in America at least, will be interdenominational. In the journals of the various communities there are calls, some direct, some indirect, for the Wesley celebration. In the "Congregationalist" of June 13, for example, we read: "We hope that John Wesley will be the theme in thousands of Congregational pulpits and prayer meetings this month." The Lutherans of the General Synod, it seems, also do not want to be absent from this colorful round dance. The Lutheran World writes June 4: "We are about to celebrate the bicentennial of John Wesley's birth." And the "Lutheran Evangelist": "We, the followers of Luther, will maintain the most fraternal relations with the followers of Wesley." Of his conversion Wesley writes: "In the evening (of the 24th of May, 1738) I went to a society in Aldergate Street (Moravians), where one was reading Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death." It has been inferred from this that Wesley taught of justification Lutheran. But this is not the case. For he does not make the word of the forgiveness of sins the ultimate ground of his confidence, but the heart with its feelings ("heart strangely warmed"). What the "North American Review" and most sectarian papers seem to like best about Wesley is his unbounded indifferentism. Of the "societies" he founded, Wesley writes: "They do not impose, in order to their admission, any opinions whatever. Let them hold particular or general redemption, absolute or conditional decrees. They think and let think. One condition, and one only, is required - a real desire to save their souls. They only ask, 'Is thy heart even as my heart? If it be, give me thy hand.' Is there any other society in Great Britain or Ireland that is so truly of a catholic spirit? Where is there such another society in the habitable world ? I know none." "You cannot be admitted into the church or society of the Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Quakers, or any others, unless you hold the same opinions with them and adhere to the same mode of worship. The Methodists alone do not insist on your holding this or that opinion." "I have no more right to object to a man for holding a different opinion from me than I have to differ with a man because he wears a wig and I wear my own hair." ("North American Review.") This indifferentism of Wesley's naturally led to modern secularized and faithless Methodism, of which "Doctrine and Precepts" has repeatedly given samples. From the beginning Methodism carried within it the germ of rationalism. The "Christian Apologist" also shares, among other things, the following words of Wesley: "I have no fear that the people called Methodists will ever cease to exist in Europe or America. But I have my fears that it may become a dead church, possessing the form of godliness, but denying the power of it." Modern Methodism is in no small part devoted to higher criticism and liberal theology, and has thus not only lost the power of godliness, but has in many instances stripped itself of the outward form of it. F. B.

In Los Angeles the Presbyterians held their meeting toward the end of May. The most important decisions were made on May 28. The Revision Committee reported that of the 233 Presbyteries almost all had declared themselves in favor of confessional revision. Of the 11 revision proposals, none had received more than 10 negative votes, despite the vigorous agitation from Princeton. Thereupon the 11 bills were voted on separately, and all were adopted without change, - "with a rush and eclat," says the "Presbyterian." Only One negative vote was cast, and that only on Bills 5, 6, and 7. After the adoption, the Chairman of the Committee, Van Dyke, declared, "This revision does not mean that the Presbyterian church has changed her base one inch, but it does mean that she has broadened and strengthened her foundations. Her divine sovereignty shall never be interpreted so as to mean fatalism." And Dr. Roberts, the secretary of the assembly, declared, "We have only made revision to remove misunderstanding .... Now ministers holding various types of Calvinism can stand together." But this is a childish self-delusion. It has long been generally recognized by Presbyterians, Methodists, and others that the revision has opened a wide gate for Arminians. The "Churchman" says: "To make such statements as these is to dispute against the sun." "The Presbyterian Church has come to see that the truth in Calvinism must not be so held as to contradict the truth in Arminianism." In other words, the Presbyterians have come to use ambiguous phrases under which Unionist Calvinists and Arminians can cower. (See "Doctrine and Defense" 48, p. 182.) The Moderator brought the whole matter of revision to a close with a prayer, in which he gave thanks that the work of fifteen years had been brought to a happy end fei. "Everything ran like a well-greased machine," says the "Presbyterian," "or slid down toward the end like an avalanche." But those who think that the liberal elements among the Presbyterians are satisfied with the present confession are greatly mistaken. Dr. Marstin declared, "Membership in the Presbyterian Church does not depend upon assent to the Confession, for which the sentence, "I believe in Jesus Christ," is sufficient." "The Herald and Presbyter writes: "One thing marred the unanimity and grated harshly on the Assembly. It was the persistence of a few men in asserting repugnance to heresy trials, and joy that there would be no more of them." People like Briggs should not be denied home rule among Presbyterians in the future, - that is the goal of liberal Presbyterians. - In order to get the "Letter Statement" among the people, it is to be added to the hymnal. - Concerning marriage and divorce, it was resolved: "1. That it shall be the duty of every citizen to work for the enactment of marriage laws by the state, which shall correspond to the demands of Christianity; 2. That preachers shall be forbidden to marry divorced persons contrary to the Scriptures". As wrong as the first is (it is not the duty of the State to make the laws of Holy Scripture the laws of the State), so zealous are the Presbyterians in this; and as right as the second is, so lukewarm are they in this matter, and, as a rule, care for nothing but the marriage-slicence in marriage ceremonies. - A Puritan resolution on Sabbath observance was also adopted, in which all games, amusements, social gatherings, pleasure trips, and excursions on Sundays, as well as Sunday newspapers and Sunday legislation, are rejected as sinful. The blending of church and state also came to light in the decision to ask the American people to remove the Mormon Reed Smoot from the Senate. Great excitement arose when

the temperance committee proposed that not only all consumption of spirituous beverages but also of tobacco was sinful and corrupt, and that total abstinence from both was necessary to Christian character. After lengthy debate, however, they succeeded in substituting "desirable" for "necessary." - For higher Presbyterian colleges $12,000,000 is to be raised. Concerning Union Seminary, it was decided that it should not be recognized as a Presbyterian institution any more than Oberlin, Harvard, and Yale. In order to initiate union with other Presbyterian synods, a committee on Presbyterian Fraternity and Union was appointed. The same was done by the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, which held its sessions at the same time at Nashville, Tenn. The Reformed Presbyterian Church, at its meeting, also held in May, considered the question whether the organ might be used in congregational singing, which had hitherto been frowned upon as "praising God with machinery." After considerable debate it was decided to submit this question to the Presbyteries for decision and to report the result at the next meeting. F. B.

II. foreign countries.

Between the "Evang.-luth. Kirche in Preußen" and the "Evang.-luth. Synod in Baden" a union has come about. In the agreement between the two synods, the six main points thus read: "First, the congregations of both church bodies presently existing in Baden recognize each other in their present state." "Secondly, with regard to communion, or congregational membership, the following rules shall apply: 1. The congregation members of both church bodies shall have free access to all altars. It remains necessary for the responsible pastor to present the church certificate. (2) If members of one congregation move to a place where there is only one congregation of the other congregation, they shall be assigned to the other congregation by their former pastor, who shall issue a certificate of attendance. (3) If, in other cases, individual members of the congregation wish to join the congregation of the other part, this can only be done with the consent of the previous pastor and by issuing the church certificate. Addendum: In the future, it should be avoided that public services are held in the same place by both church bodies. Thirdly, the pastors of both church bodies will represent each other in all official acts, where necessity requires it or otherwise appears desirable, in the usual manner among ministers of the same confession, possibly by issuing a dimissoriale. Unless otherwise stipulated, the fees of the clergy shall be paid to the clergyman actually in charge. Fourthly, the church discipline measures are mutually recognized. Fifthly, the pastors of both church bodies shall urge their parishioners to associate fraternally with the members of the other church body and, wherever opportunity presents itself, to maintain the fellowship of faith, so that all strife and jealousy may be avoided. Sixth, the provisions made in the foregoing shall, as far as practicable, also apply to Lutherans moving from Prussia to Baden or from Baden to Prussia." F. B.

Breslau and Immanuel Synod. The "Evang.-luth. Sonntagsblatt" of the Immanuel Synod of April 26 writes: "How is it with the efforts for understanding between the Lutheran church communities in Germany that are free from the state yoke? How is it especially between us and Breslau? To this we can answer with joy: Things are much more hopeful now than they were at the beginning of this year, when we were in the second half of the previous year.

In the first word of our 'Sonntagsblatt' we were already able to point out that through the publication of the Breslau Oberkirchenkollegium in No. 38 of their official church bulletin of last year, the possibility of a full peace between our two bodies, one that is pleasing to God, that is, one that is based on His word, has moved much closer. For the actual main stumbling block, the so-called 'Public Declaration', which in 1864, although not raised to the status of a confession of faith by the Breslau people, did become the norm for the decisions and actions of their church government, has now been essentially eliminated by the answer officially given to our Father Meeske in response to his letter and published for the whole church, and its previous significance has been 'withdrawn' from it. Thereupon, although for the time being only personal, oral and written negotiations have been conducted between pastors of that church and of ours, leading the longer and the more to cordial, mutual understanding. And if God the Lord continues to give his grace as before, the time will not be far off when the many years of prayers for the healing of old, deep wounds will finally find an answer and many prayers of thanksgiving will rise up to the Lord who has rebuilt the walls of Zion in spite of all our sin and unworthiness." But now "Gotthold" of the Breslau Synod protests against this interpretation of the Synodal resolution in question. He writes: "We ('Gotthold') protest against this interpretation of the resolution of our last General Synod. As questionable as the resolution may otherwise appear to us, it does not contain the fact that the 'Public Declaration' should now no longer have any validity." - Whether there will be a real union between the Breslauers and Immanuelites is thus still very doubtful. F. B.

About the visit of the German Emperor to Pope Leo XIII, the "Strasbourg Zeitung" of May 5 writes: "The Protestants of Germany have gradually become accustomed to the fact that the German Emperor, who is at the head of the largest Protestant national church, solemnly recognizes the international world position of the sovereign Pope at every possible opportunity, even though he still protests against the national unification of the allied kingdom of Italy, since he does not want to renounce a little secular rule. They ask, however, whether it was a political necessity that the Emperor should give his two eldest sons to the Pope and the Secretary of State Rampolla (!), and they see a kind of providence in the fact that the Empress was prevented from accompanying her husband. The whole Protestant imperial family waiting in the pope's antechamber for His Holiness, that would have been too distressing a spectacle for the people of the Reformation!" Contrast this with the remarks of the clerical "Germania" in Berlin, which wrote on May 8: "On the whole: The day was great in every respect! The liberals criticize the visit of a sovereign to the Holy Father and want to impose their views on him. With the German Emperor they are silent, and rightly so. They know from two experiences that William II himself knows what he must do and what he must not do, and that His Majesty has again shown the world. Majesty has again shown the world. Therefore, the day was once again a great day of honor for the Papacy, for the Emperor and for our entire fatherland! The Emperor grasped both hands offered to him and bent low on them so that his forehead touched them. I am very pleased to find Germans here in the Vatican, in the vicinity of His Holiness, and to be able to welcome among them the most reverend representatives of the German episcopate. I was very pleased to find His Holiness in such extraordinary health. I can only pray to God that he may

Se. Holiness may still preserve it for a long time for the salvation of the whole world.'" - The German Emperor seems to care neither for moral nor for religious truth as such. He values these things only as means to what seems to him the summum bonum: preservation and increase of his power. Before the liberal theologians he speaks of the "further education of religion," before the orthodox of the "divinity of Christ," before the pope of the pope's salvation for the whole world. Morality and truth the Emperor subordinates to the Hohenzollernthum. That is sad. F. B.

The following motion for the abolition of ship baptisms has been submitted to a number of Prussian district synods: "Considering that the custom of 'baptizing' ships, fortifications, and the like, 1. deprives of its dignity an expression which has been established for ages for one of the most sacred acts in Christian worship; 2. also empties this expression of its proper content and depresses it to the flat meaning of a naming; 3. 3. is therefore likely, especially in consequence of its official practice, to obscure and confuse the people's consciousness of the actual meaning and value of baptism, and thus to have a detrimental effect on the Christian edification of the people; 4. also contradicts the confessional writings of our church, in which (Schmalk. Article, XV and Appendix 73, Concordia Formula, II, 87) such baptisms are already most decidedly rejected and forbidden - the District Synod resolves to ask this year's General Synod to present the matter to His Majesty the Emperor and otherwise take appropriate steps against this custom."

The Ritualists in England. "The Old Faith" writes: "To show the reader what the whole controversy (against the Ritualists) is really about, we give a few samples from a much-used Ritualistic catechism. On the title page we read: 'A Catechism for Catholics in England, dedicated to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, in deepest reverence and guilty respect of their sacred office.' By -Catholics', of course, the writer does not mean Roman, but Anglican Catholics. There is nothing striking in this designation to the Englishman. For it is the name which ritualists generally attach to themselves. Nothing could be more erroneous than still to reckon them among the Protestants. They themselves reject this appellation with indignation. On the other hand, they claim equal rights with the Roman and Greek Catholic Churches, referring to their episcopal constitution. The content of the Catechism proves that their doctrinal view hardly differs from that of the Roman Church. On the first page we find an instruction on the 'auricular confession' with an exact indication of the wording to be used by the confessor. Then follows the 'Angelus' which is to be said three times a day with the prayer to be added: 'Grant, O Lord, that through the help of the Virgin Mary, his Mother, we may attain eternal blessedness!' The next page contains the stations of the Passion, at each of which a 'Our Father' and a 'Hail Mary' are to be prayed. Then follows the actual Christian lesson in question and answer. The 48th question is: 'Who governs the Catholic Church?' Answer: 'The Catholic Church is governed by the bishops, who are the Vicars of Christ/ Question 49: 'Wherein consists the duty of all true Christians?' Answer: 'To render obedience to the bishops in all things/ Question 53: 'What sin are those guilty of who leave the Catholic Church, in whatever country it may be?' Answer: 'The sin of schism.' Question 55: 'Do Protestants commit this sin?' Answer: 'Yes, because their clergy do not have the right to preach and administer the Sacraments, since they do not have the

have episcopal ordination? Question 98: 'How many sacraments are there Answer: -There are seven sacraments: baptism, penance, confirmation, the Lord's Supper, priestly ordination, marriage, last rites? Question 113: 'When does the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ?' Answer: 'When the priest speaks the words of Consecration.' Question 115: 'Is Holy Communion, Eucharist, merely a sacrament?' Answer: 'It is not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice?' Question 116: 'In what does a sacrifice consist Answer: 'It consists in the priest's offering a visible or sensual thing to God alone, thereby testifying to God's lordship over all things?' Next, all 'Catholic' Christians are strictly enjoined to always fast the Sacrament of the Altar. The sacred elements are to be kept for use in home communions. The latest edition of the Catechism also contains a list of 'false religions', beginning with the 'Lutherans' and ending with the 'Salvation Army'! One should not think that this catechism would take an exceptional position. On the contrary, its doctrinal position coincides with that of the entire ritualistic party. But if this is so, then the whole magnitude of the danger which the steady growth of this party means for the English state church becomes clear. And no one will be able to deny what the champion of the Protestant cause in the English Parliament, Sir William Harcourt, emphasized with great emphasis when discussing the Church Bill. The whole question, he pointed out, was not about ritual, not about the reintroduction of this or that pre-Reformation form of worship, but about the revival of the medieval church ideal, about the overthrow of Protestant liberty and truth. With that, the elevation and embellishment of the forms of worship, the hitherto high church party had to do. The ritualists of today, however, must be strictly distinguished from the High Church. They are not Anglicans, but Romanists."

The force of Rome in England. The "Imperial Messenger" writes: "Though this is not the first time that King Edward has set foot on Roman soil, his previous visit to Rome was as Prince of Wales. Now he appears there as King! But what is most remarkable about the present journey is that in this capacity as King he also pays a visit to the Pope, a circumstance which deserves great attention in view of the interest which the Roman Church has always shown for the island kingdom. In the Middle Ages the English enjoyed special papal favour, and English kings were crowned as the 'eldest sons of the Church'. Nowhere, too, was the religiosity deeper, nowhere the number of monasteries and churches greater and richer, than in England. The latter was expressed in the rich gifts which flowed to the ever gold-hungry Papal States. Incidentally, it is claimed that the Pope today receives almost as much money from the English Catholics as from the rest of Catholic Christendom. The number of Catholics in England and Scotland is now about 1½ million, with 3000 clergy and 1400 churches and chapels. In proportion to this is the number of Catholic schools and seminaries. The speed of development in the 19th century can be seen from the fact that in 1814 the number of Catholics in Britain was calculated at only 160,000 with 390 clergy. In 1840 Gregory XVI created eight vicariates in place of the previous four. Pius IX reintroduced the hierarchy in 1850 by establishing the Archbishop's See of Westminster and twelve episcopal sees. Now England has fifteen bishops. With the immigration from Ireland the Catholic Church in Great Britain constantly received new growth, which, with the now large number of churches and schools, is no longer lost to the Catholic Church as

this was formerly the case. As for monasticism in Britain, the Jesuits and Benedictines have existed since the seventeenth century, but the other monastic orders did not settle in Britain until after the re-establishment of the hierarchy, choosing as the site for their monasteries places where there had been known institutions in Catholic times. The Franciscans, Dominicans, Carmelites, and Bernardines have abbey convents here. The Carthusians, who were expelled by Elizabeth, have a large monastery at Parkminster, a 'branch' of the monastery at Chartreuse. The Premonstratensians have many monasteries, including a priory at Farnborough, built by the Empress Eugenie as a burial place for her husband and son. The Servites have two monasteries, which are among the few for which there were no precedents in pre-Reformation monastic England. The Brothers of Mercy, the Redemptorists, the Passionists, the Oblates, and the Oratorians also grace the country with their presence. It is significant that the nuns who were expelled by Elizabeth, and after various wanderings founded a convent at Lisbon, have now returned to England in their successors. To make the picture complete, it should be mentioned that several smaller foreign orders, such as 'To the Good Shepherd,' have also founded branch establishments and found adherents in England during the last few years. There has thus been no lack of places of accommodation for the numerous French friars who, in 1901, shook the domestic dust from their shoes and came to England to increase the motley company." - The watchword of this force is: reconquer England for the Pope in Rome.

F. B.

Deification of the Pabst. In a speech at the Association of Catholic Young Men in Florence, Sacchetti, chief editor of the Unitá Cattolica, said of Leo XIII: "But we Catholics see and confess with joy that the Supreme Being takes flesh (s'incarna), speaks, directs and judges in Peter, who lives on in the Roman Pontificate." In other words, the pope is an incarnation of God! According to this, we will not be too surprised when it goes on to say, "The pope is the truth, for he is Vicar of Him who said: 'I am the truth.' Our spirit rejoices at his destruction by your (the pope's) spirit, which is not the spirit of man, but the science of God Himself. Our most sacred right on earth is to believe in God. But we cannot sincerely believe in the true and living God unless we believe in thee (the Pabst) who presents on earth the majesty, the magisterium, and the invincibility of God." ... "Only then will we be a free people, when the Pabst will be entirely free, when no obstacle will any longer oppose our love-filled, childlike blind obedience, when there will no longer be any dispute among us about the minimum degree of worship we must offer him, but about the maximum degree, when the life of our people will be a continual hymn of adoration to Christ in the person of his Vicar on earth!"

The expulsion of the Mormon missionaries from Prussia and Mecklenburg has been decreed by both governments, after the same measure has been taken by Bavaria for some time. The missionaries, however, will be given time to get their affairs in order. The order was made because in recent years complaints about proselytizing by the Mormons have increased steadily, and because the Mormon religion violates German laws and public morals, in that it does not specifically exclude polygamy. At present there are 150 missionaries working in Germany, and in Prussia alone about 90 of them. The Mormon Church has about 1800 followers in Germany.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 49. July and August 1903. No. 7. and 8.

Pastors' perils of the soul.

"What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" Matth. 16, 26. This is said to all Christians, therefore also to every preacher. Even a preacher is in danger of harm to his soul. The dangers of a pastor's soul are threefold: those which he has in common with all other Christians, those which are much greater for him than for other Christians, and finally those which are not equally present for other Christians.

I.

The dangers of the soul of a preacher of the gospel are, first of all, generally the same dangers in which every Christian stands. For the devil also pursues a preacher, that he may devour him. What is said to all Christians in general in 1 Pet. 5:8, 9: "Be sober, and watch: for your adversary the devil walketh about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour. Resist him firmly in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are upon your brethren which are in the world." This is true because it is true of all Christians, including pastors. Yes, the devil has it in for them even more than for other Christians, because they hold such an office, through which great harm is done to the devil's kingdom. For this reason Christ also said to Petro the serious words: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan has desired you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith cease not," Luc. 22:31, 32. Satan's purpose, then, was to destroy Peter's faith, which he would have succeeded in doing, if Christ had not prayed so specially for Peter. For Satan feared that Peter would do him great harm; therefore he wished to make him harmless. But at the same time he had his eye on all the apostles, as the Lord indicates by the little word "you. Therefore he also went into Judas Iscarioth and drove him to betray Jesus. So from this side the pastors are threatened with great danger.

But also from the side of the godless world a pastor is threatened by the same danger to his soul that every Christian is threatened by. One would think that a pastor is more removed from the world, that he is further away from it than other Christians. And one cannot deny that other Christians come into more contact with the world than a pastor. While the latter, in their work of buying and selling, often have to deal with the children of the world, the latter, if he is the pastor of a certain congregation, usually has to deal only with Christians, or with those who want to be Christians. But nevertheless a pastor is also threatened by great danger from the side of the world. The world keeps a sharp eye on pastors and is pleased when a minister of the Word falls into sin and disgrace, or when he loses heart so that he ceases to reprove the world. Therefore saith the Lord John 15:19: "If ye were of the world, the world would have loved their own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." "But all these things shall they do unto you for my name's sake: for they know not him that sent me," v. 21. Wherefore a pastor also ought to be well on his guard against the world, that he be not deceived by the honor offered him by the esteemed of this world, to forsake the way of truth and faithfulness, to be less earnest about doctrine and life, nor be intimidated, like Peter, to deny Christ, by the dark face which the world shows him at another hour; that rather, like John, he would rather give up his head than forgive anything to the truth. Even if the world approaches him in his friends, or even in his wife, as it did Job, and tries to make him waver and give in, when he should not give in, he should not fail to see the danger in which he is in.

But also his flesh is not more pious than the flesh of other Christians. What therefore applies to all Christians in regard to their flesh, that they must crucify it along with the lusts and desires, Gal. 5, 24, also applies to pastors. For this reason Christ also gives his disciples, who wanted to become his preachers, the admonition in his passion, Matth. 26, 41: "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation. The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." And Paul, who was a great preacher, confesses without any pretence that his flesh was not a hair more pious than the flesh of other men, when he complains, Rom. 7:18: "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." It would therefore be a great danger to the soul, as it is to every Christian, so also to a pastor, if he would become secure, and not be on his guard against his own flesh. - "Watch therefore also for thyself, for thy flesh and heart, lest it corruptly withhold God's grace; for it is full of guile, and is soon able to dissemble and flatter itself in pride."

II.

Let us now go into the particulars a little more closely. First of all, we find that there are dangers of the soul for a pastor which are also present for other Christians, but which are greater for a pastor than for other Christians, and then that there are also dangers for him which are not equally present for other Christians. Among these I count 1. the danger of falling into arrogance. This danger is great for every Christian, but it is greater for a pastor, not only because, as we have seen, the devil afflicts him far more than other Christians, but also because' much more harm is done by the pastor's sin than by the sin of another Christian. Especially when a pastor has received especially glorious gifts from God, the devil will not cease to provoke him, to exaggerate his gifts, to want to be considered more than others, whether his fellow ministers or his fellow Christians. That this danger is very great for preachers, we see in the twelve apostles. How often did they argue about "which one was the greatest" among them, Marc. 9, 34. Luc. 9, 46. Matth. 20, 20-24. That is why Christ warns them so earnestly and says: "You know that the worldly princes rule, and the rulers rule. You know that the rulers of the world rule, and the overlords have power. It shall not be so among you: but if any man will be mighty among you, let him be your servant. And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant," Matt. 20:25-27. The dear apostles also took to heart what their Lord and Master had taught them, and, after they had received the Holy Ghost, did not exalt themselves one above another, neither did they suffer Christians to give preference to one over another. For we see that Paul, in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, is vehemently zealous against it, saying, "Who then is Paul? Who is Apollo? Servants are they by whom ye believed," 1 Cor. 3:5. But how many teachers of the word of God have since been overthrown by their pride. How much damage has the devil done in the church through this. How many sects have arisen through it. Through arrogance the pope has set himself up as the head of the church and as the governor of Christ. And why, twenty years ago, did some spirits begin the doctrine of the election of grace? Because, according to their conception, they had not received enough honor; that is, out of arrogance. When a pastor has given so much room to the devil that he has plunged him into arrogance, he is capable of anything. He either stays away from the conferences because he thinks he can learn nothing more there, or he attends them because he wants to shine before others as a light. And - notice this - not only quite gifted, but also quite weak or only moderately gifted pastors are in danger of becoming arrogant. For the devil may well persuade a bungler that he is a light. But God is more hostile to no sin than to pride, "for God resisteth the proud, but he resisteth the proud.

He gives grace to the humble. Let us pray, dear brethren, that God will preserve us from this great danger to our souls of falling into arrogance. Luther writes (Walch. V, 437): "Therefore it is a dangerous thing when a preacher who is right in God's word has a great following and chance that he is praised. And again also, if one speaks evil of one, promises, mocks, and despises the same. For praise and honour tickle the flesh, but blasphemy and reproach twist and hurt greatly. There is one between two stakes."

A second danger of the soul, which pastors have in common with other Christians, except that it is greater for pastors, is that of falling into avarice. It has cost a pastor a great deal, a very great deal, until he has come so far that he has been able to take up the office. And now he may only get a meager position. He sees that his former schoolmates have already come into wealth, while he has hardly enough to support himself and his wife; or, even if he has a somewhat better position, he still cannot come into wealth. This is clear to him. As long as he has the right faith, and, as they say, "his heart is in the right place," he will be content with what God gives him. But if he no longer watches rightly over himself, the devil will tempt him to avarice through his evil flesh; not immediately in a coarse way, but first in a quite fine way; but by and by he may then dare more. This danger to the soul is not so small as some may think. This was the first sin to which the devil tempted Judas, as far as we can see from the story. "For covetousness is the root of all evil." He who has first fallen into avarice will become more and more stingy, more and more greedy for money, and will soon do something for the sake of considerable accidences which he would not otherwise do, yes, even deviate from the integrity of the Word, speak to please men, etc. Luther writes (Walch. VII, 780): "Ye shall not lay up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, etc. For it is a dangerous, clinging evil, and can also make a fine appearance and beautiful thought, that it also affects Christians, and therefore no one can know himself safe. For when they see how they fare in the world, which afflicts them with all miseries, and grudges them not a morsel of bread, so that they must die of hunger for it; as now the poor preachers are made to suffer sorrow and want; so they are thus challenged, that they also think how they can get and get for themselves, so that they may remain in the world, until they fall into worldly care and avarice, and thereby fall and lie down in their preaching office, and some even forsake the gospel." The same (op. cit., 794): "Although a farmer becomes stingy and does nothing to preserve the gospel, a preacher can still be nourished, even if he is miserable. But if the preachers themselves get into trouble, the gospel will not taste good to them,

That for this cause" (for the sake of the gospel) "they should suffer or dare anything, but will make their reckoning that nothing shall be broken to their belly, and preach the things which are gladly heard, and carry money."

A third danger of a pastor's soul is that of falling into gluttony. Many a pastor lacks all physical exertion and exercise. That is already very dangerous. If, however, misfortune adds to this the fact that he does not exert himself spiritually either, because he thinks that he can do what is incumbent upon him with ease, or that the mental exertion gives him a headache, or even that it is beneath his dignity to prove himself useful to his household, then Satan, who has it in for the pastor even more than for other Christians, will provoke his flesh to desire more and more pleasures. The delicious time is largely slept away, especially in the morning hours, which are so suitable for work. The evening hours are idled away by reading newspapers, novels, and other things that only tickle the senses and excite the nerves. To calm them again, one "precious" cigar after another is smoked, the coffee must also increase in aroma, and soon a glass of wine must be added to "strengthen" the already weakened nerves. On this path it goes on and on, if no stop is put, until the pastor is a drunkard. At first he is perhaps a secret drunkard, who does not want his fellow ministers to notice it, until he discovers like-minded people among them, in whose company he then does not need to be ashamed, but is not improved either. Now there is also carousing in company, for instance, at chess or other games, and in larger towns there is probably also a visit to a remote inn, and the wheel is rolled on and on. Even the parishioners - the better ones, because the others are happy that their pastor is making such progress - are beginning to notice that things are going downhill with their pastor. He still preaches in an orthodox and artistic manner, but his sermons no longer go straight to the heart; they lack the right warmth. The law must be toned down a bit, the works of the flesh can no longer be duly punished. Those members of the congregation who already know that their pastor likes to indulge in drunkenness, sigh or are annoyed, and think or say in confidence, "How dare he preach, since he himself does not do what he preaches!" But they are too cowardly to tell him openly to his face and, if he does not repent, to tell the congregation and urge his removal from office. How many souls' damnation such a preacher may have on his conscience in the end!

Related to the preceding, or connected with it, or following from it, is the danger of falling into fornication and adultery. Prov. 23:31-33: "See not the wine, that it is red, and that it standeth fair in the glass. It enters smoothly, but afterward it bites like a serpent and stings like an adder. So shall thine eyes be after

"and thine heart shall say evil things." But he who is not given to drink is in danger of falling into sins against the sixth commandment. This danger is great for every Christian, in whatever state he may be. We experience this to our great sorrow in some of our young people, whom we have instructed and confirmed in God's Word with faithfulness and care, and also in some of our old people. Now one would think that this danger is not so great for a pastor, let alone greater than it is for other Christians, for a pastor does not come into contact with the dirty world to the same extent as other Christians. But consider that the pastor takes the worst part of the world with him into his study, namely his evil flesh, and that the devil also pursues him much more than others. For he knows very well what trouble there is when a minister of the word falls into fornication or adultery, that it does more harm to the kingdom of God when he brings down one minister than when he brings down ten young men or virgins in the congregation; as certainly the one fall of David did more harm to the kingdom of God than all the sins of the people of Israel at that time. But that this danger to the soul of a pastor is really great, very great, is evident from the fact that so many pastors have already fallen into the most terrible sins against the sixth commandment. Besides the wickedness of the devil, the fact that a pastor is often alone for a long time, shut off from all men, while other Christians are moving about among men, and then often has to associate with persons of the opposite sex, for example, when they register with him or when he has to visit them in sickness, may contribute much to the greatness of this danger. Not without reason does the Holy Spirit say to a pastor, 1 Tim. 5:3, "Admonish the young women as sisters, with all chastity." If a pastor does not stand in the right fear of God, does not watch over himself diligently, and does not pray diligently, in short, does not practice pastoral care of himself, he will not long remain undefiled.

What has been touched upon last, we may also consider as a special danger to the soul, namely, the danger that a pastor does not care enough for his own soul. While other Christians are often prevented by earthly duties from caring enough for their souls, a preacher may well be hindered from caring for his soul not only by his many official duties, but also by the thought that he has to deal with God's Word every day and therefore does not need to apply the Word of God especially to his own heart and to consider it for his own edification. It may come to pass that, in consequence of his corrupt nature, he will become indifferent and dulled against the Word of God, precisely through his daily intercourse with it; yea, that in the end he will fare with regard to God's Word as the children of Israel fared in the wilderness with regard to the manna, since they

said, "We are disgusted with this loose food." The study of the Word of God becomes a matter of business; one's heart has not much more of the blessing that the Word of God brings. And why? Because the pastor does not do enough pastoral care against himself. While he cares for the souls of his church children, he lets his own soul languish. A pastor, therefore, in all his study of the Word of God, should always apply it first to himself; but besides this, he should also spend certain hours of his time in caring entirely for his own soul. Luther often spent the best hours of the day in edifying himself and his own by meditating on the Word of God, by practicing the catechism, by prayer and song. It is also said of Dr. Walther that he spent the best hours of the day in communing with God. Surely a pastor should not think that he had no time for this. The arch-father Jacob was very busy when he came to the ford Jabbok and had to lead his wives and children across the water in the night; yet he found time to wrestle with God, Gen. 32:22-29. A pastor should only not work haphazardly, but be economical with his time, buy out the time well. A person can be very busy from early morning until late evening and still miss the main thing if he does not divide his time properly. A pastor should remember that he is also accountable to God for how he has used his time. "Grant that I may do diligently the things which I ought to do, which thy commandment leadeth me to do in my state. Grant that I may do it soon, at the time when I ought; and when I have done it, grant that it may be well done.

III.

Finally, there are also dangers for a pastor's soul, which are not, or not equally, present for other Christians; but they can arise from such dangers, which we have already learned to know, as from avarice and belly care, or from arrogance and ambition, or from sloth and laziness. The greatest danger is to fall into false doctrine, to add to or subtract from God's word, and thereby to incur God's wrath, and to deceive dear souls to hell, Revelation 22:18, 19. For by false doctrine God's name is profaned, and Christians are deceived. That this danger really exists, that no pastor is safe from it, that even no learning can protect against it, we see in so many examples from ancient and modern times.

Another great danger for a pastor is that through silence out of fear or complacency he becomes guilty of the condemnation of sinners whom he should have saved from eternal destruction as far as he is concerned, but whom he did not punish for their sin because he did not want to make enemies. For thus saith the Lord Ezek. 33, 8.:

"If I say unto the ungodly, Thou ungodly must die; and thou sayest not these things unto him, that the ungodly may be warned of his nature, the ungodly shall surely die because of his ungodly nature, but his blood will I require at thine hand." If the "ungodly man" is one who is in high standing before the world, nor is his sin one that is shameful before the world, then the danger of remaining silent is all the greater.

A third danger for a pastor is that he neglects his sacred office through indolence or for some other reason, whether he does not prepare his sermons conscientiously, does not properly separate law and gospel, or whether he does not present the beatific truth in such a way that even the simple can understand it; or whether he is negligent in private pastoral care, not punishing sinners, not frightening the secure, not encouraging the indolent, not comforting the sorrowful and despondent, not instructing the ignorant, not visiting the poor, the sick, and the dying, and so neglecting souls. For though it is not in our power to save one soul, yet God has put into our hands the means by which alone souls are to be saved, namely, his word, and we are therefore also to work with the same as if we could save all. For though those who are lost are lost through 'their own fault, yet if we have neglected anything in them, we become guilty of their ruin.

It is also not uncommon for a pastor to become discouraged, despondent, or disheartened in his ministry. He may have been working faithfully for some time in his opinion, but he does not yet see any success; indeed, instead of going forward, his congregation seems to be going backward. His work seems to be all in vain. There are people in the congregation who are always working against him, hindering and thwarting all that is good. Or the pastor feels either his own weakness or his supposed greatness, and the thought comes to him: You are not in the right place here, someone else might make a difference here, but not you. Or: In another place you might be able to do great things, but not here. To such thoughts may be added the circumstance that there has been much humanity in his calling, whether it be that he himself has taken wrong steps in order to come to this place, or that others, good friends, have helped him to the place. Now he thinks, "It was not God's will at all; God only allowed you to come here. O would God that I were called away! But who will help me? If I had friends of influence, they might get me a better place; but among men of influence I have no friends who think of me. I can perish here; no one cares for me. I must do well in the church, and slacken a little, that I may make the people think well of me.

...to make enemies of me. What's the use of going on studying if I have no chance of getting higher? "He who has not the pope for a father will not become a cardinal!" To such and similar thoughts, whether they are well-founded or unfounded, the devil and the flesh can bring a man, that is, also a pastor. But what a danger this is to his soul! To combat such danger, a pastor should first study the doctrine of the calling thoroughly and then firmly believe that he is in the right place as long as God leaves him there. If he has been misled by his own fault in his calling, he should ask God for forgiveness, and likewise for strength and wisdom to be faithful in his ministry, and then command everything to God.

These, then, are not small but great and terrible dangers of the soul in which a pastor is suspended. The contemplation of these should serve us, on the one hand, not to become secure, but to watch and pray always; and, on the other hand, to take our refuge in him who is also our souls' bishop and faithful shepherd, and also our Saviour, and who also says to every one of us who feels his weakness, "Be of good cheer, my son, thy sins are forgiven thee. Be satisfied with my grace, for my power is mighty in the weak."

Take hold of us, O sweet JEsu, Lead us through the pilgrim's way,
That we may walk in the right paths without ceasing, Let us avoid all cords And not look back again.

Let the Spirit of power, O Lord Jesus, Give strength to our spirit, That we may fervently walk after thee According to the quality of love.
Oh, Lord, make us fit for ourselves, Then our life is right.

C. Steege.

What is the difference between natural and spiritual knowledge?

(Continued.)

III. source of knowledge.

The last, reliable source of natural knowledge are the facts of outer and inner experience. The infallible source of spiritual knowledge, on the other hand, is the inspired and therefore infallible Word of Holy Scripture. The Christian and the Christian theologian does not ask, "What are the facts of experience which I must critically examine, sift, and ascertain, in order to infer from them the doctrines which I believe?

and confess? Rather, he strictly adheres to the word of Scripture, especially to the core sayings of the Bible, and he believes, teaches, and confesses as divine truths the doctrines that are laid down in expressis verbis in the Bible. In the words of Scripture and nowhere else does the Christian theologian seek the beatific truths. This, as we showed in the previous article, is the position of the Lutheran Church. But this position is not shared by all Christians and Christian theologians, now not even by all who call themselves Lutheran. The very professors in the theological schools who are appointed guardians of the church have broken down the dams with their own hands, and even liberal, critical, and evolutionist theology has poured like a great tidal wave over the various church communities in the last few decades. In German, English, and American universities, naturalism and rationalism again prevail. Naturalism, which blurs every boundary between the divine and the human, natural processes and miracles, the Christian and the pagan, nature and grace, reason and revelation, the natural and the spiritual, and seeks to understand Christianity with its Bible as a product of the spiritual development of mankind (historical evolution). Rationalism, which denies the necessity or reality or even the possibility of a special revelation of God in Word or Scripture, praises reason as the source and norm of all truths, including spiritual truths, eliminates or restricts the principle of Scripture, subordinates Scripture to the judgment of reason, and teaches Christians to draw what they believe, teach, and confess from somewhere other than Scripture alone, to test it by something other than Scripture alone, and to prove it by something other than Scripture alone. From the vulgar and philosophical rationalism of the eighteenth century, this modern rationalism differs only in that, instead of the doctrines of the sensus communis and speculative philosophy, it applies the modern evolutionistic sciences as a standard to the Bible.

Reason is the source and norm of all truth, and true religion is the religion of reason. Only in reason does God reveal Himself to man. Such is the supreme thesis of all consistent rationalists of the past as well as of the present. But what they understand by reason, which they praise so highly, the rationalists themselves often do not know. Frank says of the rationalists of the eighteenth century: "It is astonishing that the rationalists, while they bore their name from reason and repeatedly referred to reason, in no way sought to define more precisely what is to be understood by reason. In this quite different from Kant. It seemed to be a foregone conclusion that in every man there was a certain basic stock of religious-moral truths, which his very reason taught him. It

was the πρώτοι on which this entire theological direction labo

It was not known what reason was. It was thought to be a constant spiritual faculty, a constant source of knowledge, from which one could extract the truths necessary for man's religious and moral needs. But in truth this reason was nothing but the precipitate which remained after the evaporation of the former spiritual possession, after the cessation of the specifically Christian experiences. It was only a shadow, a scheme of what one had before; a piece of natural human wisdom, endowed with the remains of former riches. If anything is certain, and is also at present acknowledged, it is this, that such an innate, unchanging fund of religious-moral truth as the rationalists presuppose does not exist." ("Gesch. d. n. Th.," p. 50 f.)

The word reason is ambiguous and is not used in the same sense by all rationalists. In this, however, they all agree with each other, that they do not accept the holy Scriptures as the sole source and standard of spiritual knowledge. But he who theoretically designates anything besides Scripture as the last source and standard of Christian knowledge, independent of Scripture, or who practically draws any Christian truth from elsewhere than from Scripture, tests it by other means than by Scripture, and proves it by other means than by Scripture, is a rationalist. In theology we reject all and every form of reasoning. Whatever sense one may attach to the word reason, - in no sense at all is it the source or norm of theology. Reason can neither say of itself what the Christian must believe, nor even judge the faith presented in Scripture as to whether it is true or false. Nor does reason come into consideration as a complement to Scripture, so that both Scripture and reason, taken together, would be the complete source of Christian knowledge. In the question of what Christians are to believe, reason has not only no decisive judgment, but no judgment at all. In spiritual matters reason should always remain a pupil, always wanting only to hear and never to teach.

Reason is often understood to be the naked cognitive and reasoning faculty of the soul, which enables man to generate ideas, form concepts and compare them with one another, make combinations, distinctions, and abstractions, and also to make judgments and draw conclusions. Reason, as the faculty of thinking and reasoning, is the means of knowledge, but not the source of it, not even of natural knowledge, let alone of spiritual knowledge. Schelling, Hegel, and other philosophers who, independent of all experience, wanted to fathom and prove all truths through pure dialectics, have long since become an oil slick with their thought-constructions, and with them the

Theologians, who carried the train of these philosophers. 1) Of course, this rationalism still flourishes, in the sciences as well as in theology, but with the difference that the sciences, although they practically fall victim to this rationalism again and again in their wild hypotheses, have rejected it as a principle, while many theologians are still principally devoted to the delusion that they can construct Christian truths by mere logical thinking. And this fact is undoubtedly one reason among many why physicists and physicians often turn away from theology with contempt, because they feel that with mere operations of thought the questions: Who is God? how does a sinner become blessed? etc. can be answered just as little as questions of physics or medicine.

Reason is sometimes understood to mean the formal laws of thought, according to which, for example, one proposition may not logically cancel out or contradict another. These laws of thought are also applied in the holy Scriptures and in spiritual knowledge. How God, in fact, is...

1) These philosophers and their theological followers praise the *a priori* method of presuppositionless thinking as the only correct one, the "method of inner dialectics," of the "self-movement of thinking," of the "self-development of reason," of the "immanent development of the human spirit," and of the "necessary process of reason. Through mere logical, necessary thinking, man is able to recognize God and the world. Man needs "only to watch himself, only to watch his own fine thinking activity, only to set the penwork of the logical law in motion, and the Absolute itself will immediately spring forth; the process of human thinking is the process of divine thinking. The false idea underlying this is the "pantheistic" one of necessary evolution. But since the world is freely set by God, and creation and redemption are free acts of God, these things cannot be recognized as necessary by necessary thinking. There is more in reality than in necessity. The same is true of the free acts of God, which are present in reality. "Thinking without presupposition, which wants to spin out of itself the kingdom of truth, is unreason itself." R. Rothe, in his "Ethics," says: "Suspending all other possible data of consciousness and leaving them for the time being undecided, it (theological speculation) constructs the universe out of that alone, out of the primordial datum (the simplest fact of the consciousness of God), by virtue of the dialectic immanent in it." "It must be inexorably demanded of it (the theological speculation) that, under the fpeculative operation, it keep itself entirely free from the influence of Scriptural authority, and not, already in the individual points of doctrine, allow its procedure to be co-determined and guided by a side glance at the Bible, through the intention, or even only the desire, of obtaining a result agreeing with Scriptural doctrine." "In its construction it must take into account absolutely nothing else than the demands of thought and the 'speculative method, and know of no other auctority than that of logic and dialectic." "The primordial must alone be heard." - Theology differs from philosophy in that it proceeds from the consciousness of God, while philosophy derives its doctrines from the simplest fact of pure self-consciousness: I am I.

If God uses human language to communicate his thoughts of salvation to people, he has also conformed to the way people think and to the most general laws that govern thinking. God does not present us with propositions in Scripture, one of which cancels out the other. There are no real contradictions in the Bible, either in the teachings or in the stories. Of probably more than a thousand passages of Scripture it has been asserted in the course of time that they contradict each other. But again and again it has been proved that the Scriptures harmonize beautifully with themselves. And even if in some cases we were not able to furnish this proof, it would still be certain with us that there is no real contradiction in Scripture, the word of the infallible God. It is true that the Scriptures, which speak of heavenly things, contain many things which we cannot understand or rhyme. But such passages do not testify to contradictions in Scripture, but to a lack of knowledge in us. Darknesses and difficulties are by no means contradictions. If this were the case, all the sciences would teem with contradictions. But nowhere in Scripture is the same thing affirmed and denied in the same respect. Scripture does not violate the formal laws of thought, but rather sets forth divine truths in these very forms of thought. Therefore, although human reason is not able to discover, invent, test, or prove the doctrines of Scripture, it is able to show in apologetics that Scripture does not contradict itself in its reports and teachings. Rightly understood, therefore, it is not wrong to say that in Scripture God does not present anything contradictory to our faith, or anything that is in itself unreasonable or logically impossible. This proposition becomes false, of course, when one thinks not of the self-harmony of Scripture and its conformity to the formal laws of thought of objective reason, but of material propositions of subjective reason, and wants to determine from these whether something in Scripture is reasonable or possible. Frank, who is himself a rationalist, inasmuch as he derives Christian truths not from Scripture, but from Christian experience, the fact of regeneration, wrongly calls it rationalism when Buddeus writes: "Constat nihil omnino christianam religionem tradere, quod theologiae naturali et evidentissimis principiis repugnet." Even what the rsota ratio teaches of God does not overturn Scripture. But it does not follow from this objective "reasonableness" of Scripture, from the harmony of Scripture with itself and thus also with the logical laws of reason, that reason in its laws of thought is the source and norm of spiritual knowledge. Even for natural cognition, these formal laws of thought are not the source of cognition. They only say, in general terms, how to think correctly, but not what must be thought in order to

to recognize truth and reality. Of course, there has been no lack of philosophers who have attempted to develop all truths absolutely from the three logical laws of thought. But Fichte and his disciples have become disgraced with their dialectical tightrope walking and sleight of hand, which pretended to have derived the most concrete and complete from the most abstract and empty.

If we think of the term "reason" as referring to certain supreme propositions which reason of some time has established, it is again obvious that reason cannot be the source of theological knowledge in this sense either. If such propositions are correctly derived from real facts of experience, they express natural truths from which spiritual truths cannot be deduced. If, however, they are false propositions which the fashionable philosophy or science of any age has established, everyone will have to admit that a lie in the natural sphere cannot become the mother of a truth in the spiritual sphere. It was the deepest conceivable humiliation and greatest disgrace of theology when its representatives posed as "scientific" theologians and, as learned disciples, settled down at the feet of the philosophers (Plato, Philo, Aristotle, Spinoza, Kant, Schelling, Hegel, Spencer) in order to utilize the propositions obtained here as starting points and dominants of Christian dogmatics and thus to prove Christianity to be a reasonable and necessary truth, as was the case, for example, with the Gnostics. This was the case, for example, with the Gnostics, the scholastics, and the speculative theologians of the 18th and 19th centuries. In these proud spirits the word was fulfilled: φάσχοντες ε "αι σxxφxπ έμωράνδησαν, Rom. 1, 22. For in their endeavor to construct the Christian dogmas out of the philosophical propositions of the time, they fell a victim to a threefold folly: from one proposition, which after all expresses only one thought, they believed that they could deduce a whole system of thoughts, draw truths from a lie, and extract spiritual doctrines from a proposition in the natural domain. 1)

1) Like many philosophers, speculative theologians often confuse reason with imagination. What they claim to be constructions of reason are in reality fairy-tale poems of the imagination, in which no special weight is attached to logic, consistency, and truth. The creations of Marheinecke, Daub, and Rothe, for example, differ from actual fairy tales only in that they are poems in the abstract and claim to express absolute truth. The system of Richard Rothe († 1867), for example, Seeberg thus summarizes: "In the beginning was the absolute. God generates Himself from this potentiality. From the Absolute emerges the spiritual and the material. Man becomes the counter-image of God. But the right mixture of the elements in him wavers, sensuality prevails. This is sin. In Christ the right mixture is present, because he was not created and was free from sensuality. Salvation proceeds from him. It is the through-

If we understand reason to mean human thought in connection with the facts of inner and outer experience that are subordinated to it, then reason is indeed a rich source of all kinds of knowledge, but not of the spiritual but of the natural realm. In natural facts there are no Christian truths. That is why no art, no matter how skilful meeutics, is able to elicit them from them. And this is not merely because human reason is blind and unable to discern spiritual truths at all, but, as I have said, because the spiritual is not immanent in the natural. Even the most perfect reason would not be able to extract an atom of specifically Christian doctrine from the facts of experience. For the same reason, reason cannot be the source of Christian knowledge, if by reason is meant the stock of natural truths that man has acquired in the course of time. For although in this treasure all kinds of knowledge of God and his law can be found, there is nowhere to be found an actual Christian truth or a germ and approach to it. The mighty oak tree lies preformatively in the acorn, - but among all the truths of reason there is none that could be gradually developed into spiritual truth through culture. If there are no Christian truths in the facts that are subject to reason, they cannot be found in the teachings that reason has drawn from these facts in the course of the centuries.

We also rightly speak of "Christian reason," "enlightened reason," and "Christian consciousness. We are thinking of the Christian truths which we have learned from the Bible in Christian churches and schools, which we have absorbed into our minds and imprinted on our memories. From this treasure we can and should take and share with others. But though streams of spiritual truths may flow from our bodies, even the best-instructed reason is not the ultimate source of knowledge. The last source is and remains alone the holy Scriptures, from which also the enlightened reason has received its light and must always receive it anew. Philippi writes: "The source from which dogmatics must draw, then, is the reason of the dogmatizing subject, enlightened by revelation. .. . We have now recognized the threefold source from which Christian dogmatics has to draw its material, namely, the enlightened reason of the dogmatizing subject.

The same thing also causes 'unconscious Christianity'. This also brings about 'unconscious Christianity'. Thus it is understood that the church must be absorbed into the state. Finally, Christ's parousia and a last conversion take place. The wicked decay into matter. That is their torment." ("An d. Schwelle," p. 88.) At any rate, reason is here so much diluted with fancy and nonsense, that even a connoisseur can no longer get through it. "Christian dogmatics" - says Shedd - "is what a theologian finds (in the Bible), not what he originates."

Subject, the doctrine of the Church, and the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. . . . From our entire development up to this point, it is self-evident that the doctrine of Scripture will not, as in the older dogmatics, be placed with us at the beginning, but at the end of each article of faith, because we regard Scripture not as the first source, but as the last norm of dogmatic knowledge." Enlightened is Philippi's reason insofar as it is filled with Christian doctrines. But this does not make his assertion that Scripture comes into consideration for the theologian only as a "final norm" but not as a "first source" any less false.

It was rationalism when the Gnostics passed off their Oriental-Greek speculations as Christian gnosis, scientific Christianity. For, like the Ritschlians today, they too took out of Christianity only a few terms, poured out of these wineskins the good old Christian wine, and filled them with their own dreams and heresies. And like the scientific theologians of all times, they declared their speculations to be the higher theological knowledge, to which the Christian faith formed only the lower preliminary stage. The Christian apologists, too, often mixed spiritual and natural truths and the sources of both rationalistically into one another, when, e. g. Christianity as the highest reason and most perfect philosophy, or attempted to derive it from reason and to prove it with reason, or taught only a gradual difference between the wisdom of the philosophers and that of the Christians, the Logos in paganism and in Christianity, and thereby placed Christ and Socrates, Moses and Plato, the prophets and the Pythagoreans theologically side by side. We also encounter gross rationalism in Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and other church fathers, who sought to mediate philosophy and Christianity, brought Platonic and other philosophical thoughts into theology, remodeled Christian doctrines according to them, and interpreted Scripture, not contenting themselves with this, not content with fighting the heathen opponents with philosophical weapons, but were bent on deriving the Christian doctrines from reason and demonstrating them with reason, and defined the difference between a Christian and a Christian theologian to the effect that the theologian "knows" what the ordinary Christian believes.

In the Middle Ages there was much talk about the relationship of philosophy to theology, and it was strongly emphasized that philosophy had to serve as ancilla to its domina, theology. Peter Damiani writes: "Artis humanae peritia non debet jus magisterii sibimet arroganter arripere, sed velut ancilla dominae subvenire, ne si praecedit aberret." The ancillari of reason in the Middle Ages, however, consisted, in fact, in the fact that philosophy functioned as the eye of theology, and

The Scholastics' expressed purpose was to justify the teachings of the Church before the forum of reason. The expressed purpose of the scholastics was to justify the teachings of the Church before the forum of reason, to prove that what the Christian accepted on the word of Scripture and the Church was philosophically true, and thus to elevate faith to knowledge. With this, however, the roles were reversed: Sarah, the mistress, was reduced to a maid, and Hagar, the slave, was elevated to the mistress of the house. It was the crudest rationalism when some of the scholastics, with Abelard and Scotus Erigena, conceded to reason primacy over authority and asserted: the Christian faith follows reasoned cognition and knowledge, and philosophy is identical with theology. John Scotus Erigena writes: "Conficitur inde veram philosophiam esse veram religionem conversimque veram religionem esse veram philosophiam." Further, "Auctoritas siquidem ex vera ratione processit, ratio vera nequaquam ex auctoritate." Rationalism it was,

When other scholastics, with Anselmus of Canterbury, let rational knowledge follow faith, revelation, and authority as the higher level of Christian knowledge, changed the credo, quia intelligo into credo, ut intelligam, ascended from the ground of authority and faith to rational knowledge, and even wanted to demonstrate the mysteria fidei (Trinity, Incarnation, Reconciliation, etc.) with reason.) with reason and taught that the educated layman and theologian scientifically recognize and understand what the ignorant people accept in faith. In

"Cur Deus Homo" Anselmus declares that his intention is "rationabili necessitate intelligere, esse oportere omnia illa, quae nobis fides catholica de Christo credere praecipit". And according to Richard of St. Victor, the task of theologians is "quod tenemus ex fide, ratione apprehendere et demonstrativa certitudinis attestatione firmare. Quenstedt is right when he writes: "Theologia scholasticorum est mera mixtura theologiae et philosophiae."

It was rationalism when Zwingli rejected the clear scriptural teaching of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper with the declaration: God does not require of us that we believe impossible things, and in so doing took the judgment as to whether something was possible not from Scripture, but from his reason, and that also not from formal, but from material reason, namely, the ideas of space and time, which Zwingli had absorbed, and all kinds of false views of Christ's person, of heaven, of the Ascension, and of sitting at the right hand of God, and sought to twist the clear words of the Lord's Supper with misunderstood passages from Scripture. 1) Of Calvin, Shedd. praises:

1) When in 1529 Zwingli and Oekolampad at Marburg operated rationalistically from their concepts of space and body against the Scriptural doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and first Zwingli said: "Unum enim et idem corpus in diversis locis esse non

"No theologian was ever less influenced by a school of philosophy, or by human science or literature, than the Genevan reformer." But even Calvin did not keep himself free from rationalism, for he does not make the word of Scripture, but absolute election, the starting point and norm of his entire theology, and that in such a way that he constructs his entire system from this doctrine, interprets Scripture according to it, and determines which doctrines can be included in his system and which cannot, and, in the interest of this doctrine, twists and eliminates the series of Scriptures which teach universal grace, redemption, and efficacy in the word. What can be considered truth in theology is not decided here by Scripture, but by Calvin according to the standard of his supreme proposition of God's sovereignty and absolute election. 1)

potest", to which Oekolampad replied: "Ex corporum circumscriptione oportet corpus quodlibet in uno quodam loco tantum statui", Luther, as a true theologian of Scripture, declared: "*Mathematicas divisiones hic audire nolo.* Deus, id quod etiam sophistae concesserunt, efficere potest, ut unum corpus, vel in uno loco tantum, vel in pluribus locis, simul vel extra omnem locum sit, quodque simul plura corpora in uno loco contineantur. Quam ob rem de praesentia hujus, sive in loco, sive extra locum, sic anxie disputare nolo, nihil mea refert, *neque ejusmodi rationis argumenta, sed aperta firmaque scripturae verba requiro.* Quod si tamen omnino sic libet ad condictam horam ex mathematica ad noctem usque vobiscum disputare volo. *Praedico autem hisce disputationibus in hac causa nihil posse effici. Scripturae testimoniis hic opus est.*" (Aurifaber, "Letters und Acten," p. 12.)

1) Reformed rationalism, which insists that the doctrines of theology legitimize themselves before the forum of reason, which in the final analysis does not accept Scripture but a supreme proposition as the doctrinal norm and grants everyone the right to interpret Scripture according to the principles of his reason, is represented in America by Shedd, Hodge and the Baptist Strang. Shedd calls the "exegetico-rational method" the only correct one in theology. He writes in "Dogmatic Theology": "The proper mode of discussing any single theological topic is: 1. Exegetical. 2. Rational. The first step to be taken is, to deduce the doctrine itself from Scripture by careful exegesis; and the second step is, to justify and defend this exegetical result upon grounds of reason." (I, 10.) "When the work of deriving doctrines from Scripture has been done, the theologian must defend them against attacks, answering objections, and maintaining the reasonableness of revealed truth." (I, 14.) Hodge writes in "Systematic Theology" : "It is the prerogative of reason to judge of the credibility of a revelation." "Christians concede to reason the judicium contradictionis, that is, the prerogative of deciding whether a thing is possible or impossible." "It is impossible that God should require us to believe what contradicts any of the laws of belief which He has impressed upon our nature." (I, 50.) "It is impossible that one truth should contradict another. It is impossible, therefore, that God should reveal anything as true which contradicts any well - authenticated truth, whether of intuition, experience, or previous revelation." (I, 51.) "Men may abuse this prerogative of reason, as they abuse their free agency. But the

Melanchthon, too, rationalistically abused the scriptural principle when he drew the conclusion from the universality of divine love that the reason why some are blessed before others lies in their better conduct against the offered grace, and thus, in the interest of reason, abandoned the sola gratia. Melanchthon writes: "Cum promissio sit universalis, nec sint in Deo contradictoriae voluntates, necesse est in nobis esse aliquam discriminis causam, cur Saul abjiciatur, David recipiatur, i. e., necesse est, aliquam esse actionem dissimilem in his duobus." Melanchthon does not ask what Scripture answers to this question, nay, he cares not for the numerous particulae exclusivae in Scripture, which were not unknown to him, but simply follows his reason with its N606886 68t. Thus, in this piece, Melanchthon had in fact granted reason primacy over sacred Scripture and conceded: 1. that reason may set up its conclusions as doctrines of faith; 2. that reason is entitled to correct the clear statements of Scripture in the interest of "necessary reasoning"; and 3. that reason may use a proposition obtained by "necessary reasoning" as a standard for the interpretation of Scripture and decide according to it whether something may be considered a doctrine of faith or not. This was rationalism, and we find the same nationalism in Latermann and the more recent American and European synergists. But what is true of Calvinists and synergists is true of all theologians who want to derive some doctrine of faith from a certain proposition by logical deduction instead of from Scripture alone, regardless of whether this proposition, which their reason uses as a theological source and standard, is taken from Scripture or not, regardless also of whether it is true or false in itself. He who in theology passes off his conclusions for doctrines of faith is a rationalist. He takes the authority of Scripture and gives it to reason, and thus puts man in the place of God.

Rationalism celebrated its orgies in the 18th century, when some elevated the sensus communis, others the critical and speculative reason to the theological chair, and all with the miracles and prerogative itself is not to be denied. We have a right to reject as untrue whatever it is impossible that God should require us to believe. He can no more require us to believe what is absurd than to do what is wrong." (I, 52.) "We are to try the spirits. But how can we try them without a standard? and what other standard can there be, except the laws of our nature and the authenticated revelations of God?" (I, 53.) "Reason must judge of the evidence by which a revelation is supported.... As we cannot believe without evidence, and as that evidence must be appropriate and adequate, it is clearly a prerogative of reason to judge of these several points." (I, 53.) (Strong in "Systematic Theology": "The science of theology is a product of reason, but of reason as including a power of recognizing God which is practically inseparable from a love for God." (S. 3.)

When some denied the necessity, others the reality, others the possibility of all revelation; when some taught that the Bible could not possibly teach anything that contradicted the principles of reason, others that revelation did not exist and that reason was the source of all religious knowledge: Revelation does not exist, and reason is the source of all religious knowledge, others: the Scriptures contain divine revelation, but the truths of it can also be found by reason, and still others: that reason is not able to find many of the truths of the Bible itself, but that it is able to comprehend all of them, after they have been presented in Scripture, and to prove them to be reasonable; when even the supranaturalists, by whom Kant and the vulgar rationalists were zealously opposed, often abandoned the principle of Scripture and made the most precarious concessions to reason in theology. 1)

1) Thus, for example, Reinhard elevates the consensus of reason or of the philosophical parties to the standard of theological knowledge, when in his "System of Christian Morals" he writes thus: "From this it follows ... that the claims and principles of the same (the Christian moral doctrine) may and should be examined by reason, but cannot be declared imperfect and incorrect other than by generally valid principles, that is, in such a way that all philosophical parties are satisfied with them. For as soon as the latter could be accomplished, Christianity would be manifestly false, and lose altogether the reputation of a divine revelation. But as long as the principles according to which one wishes either to improve or even to reject the moral doctrine of Christianity are not generally acknowledged to be the only correct ones, but are established as such merely by this or that school, one cannot yet appeal to human reason in general, but it is merely the interpretation which a certain party makes of the laws of reason that is opposed to Christianity." (I, 32.) The consensus of the philosophical parties is, according to Reinhard, to apply against Scripture. This is reminiscent of the proposition that has been repeatedly put forward in recent years: Scripture, especially Genesis 1, is to be interpreted according to the results of science, especially modern astronomy, geology, and archeology. If a proposition of science had found general acceptance, then it was also time for the theologian to remodel his doctrines according to it, and to explain or correct Scripture according to it. - The assertion that Scripture does not contradict the truths of science is correct and does not involve rationalism. God, the author of all truths, does not contradict himself. But he who concludes from this that the Scriptures are not to be explained from themselves, but are to be interpreted according to the consensus of the philosophers or Scientists, grants reason primacy over the Scriptures. This is entirely in line with the claim of the papists that the Bible must be interpreted according to tradition and, in the last instance, according to the doctrinal decisions of the pope. On the declaration of the Council of Trent, "Ecclesiae (Papae) est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum Sanctaru," Hodge remarks: "If there be two standards of doctrine of equal authority, the one the explanatory, and infallible interpreter of the other, it is of necessity the interpretation which determines the faith of the people." (I, 128.)

But no less luxuriantly do the weeds of rationalism proliferate in the scientific, experimental, critical, and evolutionist theology of the nineteenth century, of which Schleiermacher is the father. This modern theology, it is true, boasts that it has dealt the death blow to the rationalism of the 18th century, and yet it too, the modern theology which denies inspiration, does not wish to be bound to Scripture in its theologizing, but rather (as Seeberg says, "On the Threshold," p. 44) "goes its own way in strict scientific method and slow work," yes, subordinates the whole Scripture in form and content to the judgment of reason and wants to be absolutely free science fine, - it too is only a new species of the old genus "rationalism." But of this next time.

Rationalism is basically also papism and enthusiasm. It is the thoughts and images, feelings and experiences of their own hearts, which the enthusiasts substitute for the holy Scriptures and make the foundation of their faith and thus the source of spiritual knowledge. And if they oppose the inner word to the outer word, and the spirit to the letter, it is at bottom always only their own spirit, their own reason, which they praise in contrast to the holy Scriptures. Even Hodge writes of the enthusiasts, "They understood by the right of private judgment, the right of every man to determine what he should believe from operations of his own mind and from his own inward experience, independently of the Scriptures." (I, 80.) But of the pope, the "brain of all papists," and the paragon of all enthusiasts and rationalists, who alone claims to be the infallible interpreter of Holy Scripture and teacher of the Church, who lies that in scrinio sui pectoris all spiritual truths lie resolved, and that every man, in case of loss of his blessedness, is guilty of believing his words, as often as he opens his mouth ex cathedra as doctor et pastor ecclesiae, Luther writes in the Schmalkaldic Articles: "For the papacy is also a vain enthusiasm, in which the pope boasts that all rights are in the shrine of his heart, and what he judges and says with his churches is to be spirit and right, even if it is above and against Scripture or the oral word." (Müller, p. 321, § 4.) According to the Roman view, the papal magisterium, connected with tradition, is both: interpreter and complementum of sacred Scripture. The pope does not merely say what Scripture may teach, but adds others at will to the teachings of the same. This is gross rationalism.

That human reason is neither the place of discovery nor the touchstone of spiritual knowledge is attested by Scripture in innumerable places and in various ways. For example, when it declares once and again that the Christian doctrines are mysteries revealed by God, when Christ testifies that he does not speak of earthly things, but of things which he saw in heaven, in the bosom of his Father, and when he solemnly declares that he does not speak of earthly things, but of things which he saw in heaven, in the bosom of his Father.

When he refers his disciples to the Comforter, who will guide them into all truth, when Scripture says of spiritual truths that no eye has seen them, no ear has heard them, and that they have not entered into any man's heart; When it testifies of the Gospel that it is a vexation to the Jews and a foolishness to the Greeks; when it exhorts Christians to bring their reason under the obedience of faith; when it warns against philosophy and the introduction of its propositions into theology; when it exhorts the teachers of the church to present only God's word in church: these are all mighty testimonies that the Christian doctrines cannot and ought not to be drawn from reason, proved by reason, and tested by reason. 1) F. B.

(To be continued.)

Recent Pentateuch Criticism.

(Continued.)

I.

3. the testimony of the new testament.

For the Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch, after the self-testimony of the Book of Five and the testimony of the other books of the Old Testament, there is still a series of biblical statements to be brought into the field, and in some respects the strongest and most convincing. These are

1) Pagan philosophers have said that man will not find the truth and solve the mystery of the world if God Himself does not reveal Himself to man. And John Locke writes in his "Essay Concerning Human Understanding": "In reasonings concerning eternity, as any other infinite, we are apt to blunder, and involve ourselves in manifest absurdities. Hence the light of revelation that God has been pleased to give it on these matters must carry it against the possible conjectures of reason." The main question in the world's mystery is precisely, "What does God intend to do with the sinner?" And this question no human reason is able to answer of itself. Where reasoning proceeds correctly and does not degenerate into mere guessing, it ends every time in the ἀπορία: "Man lies under the wrath of God, - is there salvation for him from the curse?" This question reason must indeed ask, but cannot properly answer. The last statement of prudent reason here coincides every time with the judgment of conscience, "Thou art a sinner; thou art lost." If, of course, reason carelessly leaves the ground of facts and resorts to guessing or denial, it arrives at the heathenish propositions, "You can propitiate God by your own works and penances, and do enough for your sins," or, "God's wrath exists only in your imagination; God forgives even without atonement." But with these false answers man cannot even appease his own conscience.

the clear and unambiguous statements of the New Testament, the words of the true Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, and of His apostles inspired by the Holy Spirit. Here, too, it would go too far to go into all the passages that can be considered and used. We will now disregard the fact that the entire New Testament refers to the Pentateuch in almost innumerable places, often citing it directly as a holy scripture, and thus designating it as the inspired Word of God. For example, there are more than 60 references to the fifth book of Moses alone in the New Testament, and the late American theologian, Dr. Howard Crosby, has made the same attempt. Howard Crosby, commenting on the story of Christ's temptation, in which the Lord three times holds up a scriptural word from Deuteronomy as a scriptural word to the devil, remarked, "Imagine, if you can, the Messiah, in selecting the fittest words to meet Satan's assault, taking up a fragment of a forged book, a book which was a stupendous lie, framed by priestcraft." (Cf. Matth. 4, 4. 7. 10. with Deut. 8, 3. 6, 16. 6, 13.) All the historical moments touched upon in the Pentateuch from the creation to the death of Moses are taken up and discussed in the New Testament, not only those that had outstanding significance for the history of salvation, but also Balaam's talking ass (2 Pet. 2, 15. f.) and Sarah's jewelry (1 Pet. 3, 6.). But we cannot go into this in detail here. 1) We will now pick out only a few passages in which the name of Moses is expressly mentioned in connection with a passage from the Pentateuch, first from the Gospels. Matth. 8, 4. (Marc. 1, 44. Luc. 5, 14.) Jesus says to the leper: "Go and show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift which Moses commanded, for a testimony concerning it," and thereby refers to a passage from Leviticus (3 Mos. 14, 2.), which is so ha'rt contested by the newer criticism. Matth. 19, 7. f. (Marc. 10, 3. ff.) the Pharisees ask the Lord, "Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement, and to divorce her?" The Pharisees, who with this question refer to Deut. 24:1, consider Moses to be the author of the law, the Torah, and that of the written law, which the context leads to (v. 4: "Did you give her a letter of divorce?

1) For more detail on this point, see Rupprecht, "Des Rätsels Lösung," (I, 38 ff.), Beyer, "Das erste Buch Mose in den vier Evangelien," Caven, "The Testimony of Christ to the Old Testament," in "The Presbyterian and Reformed Review" (III, 401), and Nösgen, "Die Aussagen des Neuen Testaments über den Pentateuch." The latter is the only German university professor who still holds to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, but he is admittedly not regarded as fully qualified, since he is not an Old Testament theologian, but a New Testament exegete. If we are not completely mistaken, the article on the Pentateuch in Meusel's well-known "Kirchlichen Handlexikon" (V, 207 ff.), which is noteworthy in several respects, comes from him.

not read?"). Jesus answered them: "Moses permitted you to separate from your wives because of the hardness of your hearts; but from the beginning it was not so. Marc. 7, 10. it is said again from the mouth of Jesus to the Pharisees and scribes: "Moses said, Thou shalt honour thy father and thy mother: and whosoever curseth father or mother shall surely be put to death", and this time the Lord quotes a passage from the second book of Moses (20, 12.). Now if in these passages it is only said, Moses commanded, commanded, permitted, said, in others it is expressly said, Moses wrote. Already in the parallel to Matth. 19 in Marcus (10, 4.) the Lord answers the Pharisees: "Because of your hardness of heart he (Moses) wrote such a commandment to you." Marc. 12, 19. (Luc. 20, 28. Matth. 22, 24.) The Sadducees, who also consider the Pentateuch as written by Moses, say to the Lord: "Master, Moses wrote to us: If any man's brother die, and leave a wife, and leave no children, his brother shall take his brother's wife, and raise up seed unto his brother." They thus refer to Deut. 25:5; and immediately a few verses further (v. 26.) it is then said from the mouth of JEsu, "But of them that are dead, that they shall rise again, have ye not read in the book of Moses by the bush, how that God spake unto him, saying: I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" The Lord thus again cites a passage from the second book (Ex. 3, 6.), and calls the whole fifth sacred work, the present Torah, after its author, the "Book of Moses." In the parallel passage in Lucas (20, 37.) it is said somewhat differently, but no less clearly, "But that the dead rise, Moses also signified" (indicated, proclaimed, "by the bush," etc.). In this third evangelist, moreover, we have some very definite testimonies. Cap. 16, 29. 31. saith Abraham to the rich man, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear the same." "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe if any rise from the dead." As by the expression "prophets" are to be understood the writings of the prophets, from which a section, a so-called Haphtara, was read to the Jews on every Sabbath, so by "Moses" is meant the Book of Moses, the Torah, the Pentateuch, which was divided into 54 sections or parashas, one of which was always read on every Sabbath. 1) On the way to Emmaus the risen Saviour began "from Moses and all the prophets" and laid out to the two disciples "all the scriptures which were spoken of him", Luc. 24, 27. Moses therefore wrote scriptures as well as the prophets and in them prophesied of Christ. And on the evening of the day of resurrection the Lord said to the assembled disciples, "All things must be written.

1) Cf. Apost. 13, 15. 15, 21. Luc. 4, 16. f.

what is written of me in the law of Moses, in the prophets and in the psalms" and then opened to them the understanding of the Scriptures, Luc. 24, 44. ff. For the last time before his ascension, Jesus here cites the Old Testament Scriptures, designates them according to the known Jewish division, and lists all three parts by their distinctive names. The "Law of Moses" is precisely the well-known, definite Torah, the Pentateuch; the "Prophets" are the so-called XXXXX, which comprise the prophetic historical books and the prophetic books of prophecy; and the "Psalms" are the so-called XXXXX, or ἁγιόγραφα, by which are meant the poetical books, so called after their first and most distinguished part, the Psalter. And just such round and clear testimonies we read in the fourth Gospel. Philip says to Nathanael, "We have found him of whom Moses wrote in the law, and of whom the prophets wrote, Jesus, the son of Joseph of Nazareth," John 1:45. These words evidently signify three things, first, that Moses wrote at all; second, that he wrote the law, the well-known Torah, the Pentateuch; and third, that he wrote of Christ in the law. Joh. 8, 5. The scribes and Pharisees, when dealing with the adulteress, say to the Lord: "Moses commanded us in the law to stone such," and thereby refer to a commandment that is found in 3 Mos. 20, 10. and 5 Mos. 22, 22. But the most powerful testimony is given by the Lord himself in the words which he speaks to the Jews: "Think not that I will accuse you before the Father. There is one who accuses you, Moses, in whom you hope. If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me: for he hath written of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" Joh. 5, 45. ff. On this subject Rupprecht aptly remarks at the close of a longer discussion of this passage: "The whole point of the discourse lies in the contrast of the two personalities, Moses, who speaks to them (the Jews) from the past in his writings, and JEsu, who speaks to them in the present, hence in oral words. He is the great authority, which also gives his writings their authority, to which they think they must submit. He himself (Jesus) is the lesser contemporary, whose words are in themselves no authority at all to them. But even to them his words would have to become authoritative, if they believed in truth Moses' -scriptures'. For the very authority of this great Moses covers his person and his words by means of his writings. - Thus Jesus says, in brief words, that the writings traced back to Moses' authority, the Pentateuch with all its Messianic content woven into them, are indeed derived from Moses, and that this undoubted certainty gives Him, Jesus, the right to claim full authority for His words, because Moses' authority precedes Him.

must cover their eyes. In short, the Pentateuch has Moses for its author. And only in so far as this is the case can JEsus demand faith from the Jews here." 1)

To these testimonies of the Lord and his evangelists about the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch we add some direct statements from the other books of the New Testament. Here, too, we cannot go into the numerous other references of these books to the Pentateuch, as instructive as this would be. Apost. 3, 22. Peter says to the people after the miraculous healing of the lame man: "Moses said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you", and thereby quotes the well-known Messianic prophecy Deut. 18, 15. ff. The same is done by Stephen in his speech before the High Council, Apost. 7, 37, which also belongs here in content. Apost. 15, 21. Jacob the Younger says of the Sabbath reading of the Pentateuch simply: "Moses hath from long ages been preached in all the cities that preach him, and is read every Sabbath day in the schools." We see Paul's position from the following sayings. Before Felix he confesses that he believes "all things that are written in the law and in the prophets," Apost. 24, 14. And that he does not hold some unknown greatness to be the author of the law, the Pentateuch, but Moses, he testifies before Festus and Agrippas with the words, "I say nothing save what the prophets have said should come to pass, and Moses," and before the Roman Jews, to whom he "preached of JEsu out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from early morning till evening," Apost. 26, 22. 28, 23. How often this apostle refers to the Pentateuch in the Epistle to the Romans (cf. e.g. Rom. 4 and 9) and then says again quite definitely and directly: "Moses writes of the righteousness that comes from the law: Whoever does this, he will live in it", Rom. 10, 5. and thereby cites again the book of Leviticus, 3 Mos. 18, 5, which is so heavily contested. Likewise in the Epistles to the Corinthians. There he says: "In the law of Moses it is written: Thou shalt not bind up the mouth of thine ox that threshes," 1 Cor. 9:9, a quotation from Deut. 25:4; in the following 10th chapter of the first Epistle he refers ten times in the first ten verses to the books of Exodus and Numbers, and in the second Epistle he finally says very briefly of the Torah: "To this day, when Mofes is read, the ceiling hangs before their (the Jews') heart," 2 Cor. 3, 15. Finally, we recall only one passage from the Epistle to the Hebrews, which otherwise, on account of its Levitical contents, is to be extensively dwelt upon in this question. There it says: "For when Moses had spoken of all the commandments under the law unto all things.

1) "The solution of the riddle." I, 72 f.

He took the blood of calves and of goats with water and purple wool and hyssop and sprinkled the book and all the people", Hebr. 9, 19. The writer of the letter to the Hebrews refers to the event told in Exodus 24, 5. ff. and confirms explicitly the existence of a book, the so-called book of the covenant written by Moses, Exodus 24, 4. 7. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers to the story told in 2 Mos. 24, 5. ff. and confirms the statement of the existence of a book, the so-called book of the covenant written by Moses, 2 Mos. 24, 4. 7. In short, everywhere we look, the New Testament testifies to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch entrusted to the Jews, Rom. 3:2, 9:4. Christ and his apostles not only tacitly agree with the general conviction of that time, but expressly confirm it and set their seal upon it, Christ, the faithful and true witness, Revelation 3:14, and the apostles, inspired by the Holy Spirit in their writings, 1 Corinthians 2:13. Moses, according to the testimony of the New Testament, is the author of the Pentateuch. 1)

How does the newer criticism come to terms with this testimony of the New Testament? Let us first let a few representatives have their say. Strack, years ago, in a lengthy article on the Pentateuch, had already said: "Against the use of the New Testament citations we must protest, in spite of Keil, Introduction, § 39, note 2, since, if they prove anything at all, there is no need of other proofs, and any citation of further proofs would be a disparagement of this proof which appeals to the authority of the Lord and His apostles, and since by such use the controversy is transferred from the historical-critical to the dogmatic field." 2) In his "Introduction," he then expounds on the "testimony of the New Testament" cited by German, English, and American theologians with the following words: "Jesus says John 5:46 f.: 'If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me: for he hath written concerning me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?' Cf. Matt. 19:8. where Deut. 24:1. is adduced as a word of Moses; Marc. 12:26. and Luc. 24:27, 44." These are all the passages of the New Testament which Strack names. He then continues, "The authority of the Lord, and in a certain sense also of his apostles, has for all

1) In order to bring also an extra-biblical testimony for the then prevailing conviction that Moses was the author of the Code, we place here a well-known passage of Josephus, who, in his "Antiquitates judaicaes," relates how Judas and Matthias, with forty youths, said to Herod in reference to the Law (ὁ νόμος): "It is not strange if we consider the commandments which Moses wrote and left by inspiration and instruction of God more worthy of observation than your commands" *(θαυμαστόν re Οί> όει> el τών σών δογμάτων άξιωτέρονς τηρεϊσΰαι. ήγημεϋα τονς νόμους, ους M,ωϋσής υπαγορεύσει και διδαχή του Οεου γραψάμενος κατέλιπεν).* XVII- 6, 3.

2) Duke-Plitt, "Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche". Second edition, XI, 441.

the questions in relation to which they are invoked, to be considered absolutely sufficient and decisive. Any addition of further reasons would be a degradation of this incomparable authority. But who, possessing even a tolerably clear conception of the difficulty and intricacy of the problems posed by criticism, can seriously believe that these problems are really and finally settled by the way in which the New Testament cites the Pentateuch? It follows that for questions of literary criticism we must not refer at all to the quotations in the New Testament. Even supposing that the Saviour, whose knowledge was not absolute during his earthly sojourn, Marc. 13, 32, had known exactly how each individual book of the Old Testament came into being, he could not have said, without diverting attention from the main matter, and thus seriously endangering the highly important purpose of his teaching: 'In the law, which you rightly regard as one willed by God, but wrongly as one written in its present wording by Moses himself, is written.'" Steuernagel expresses himself thus: "As certainly as tradition in itself must not be disregarded, because without it all historical research would be impossible, so decidedly is it to be emphasized, especially on the ground of Protestantism, that scientific research may not consider itself bound by a tradition, however old it may be, without further ado, that it is rather obliged to examine every tradition impartially as to its value, that is, to exercise criticism of it. Scientific research in our question is not released from this obligation even by the fact that the Christian Church, too, has taken over from the Jewish community the tradition that the Pentateuch is the work of Moses, nor by the fact that the New Testament writers and even Jesus have shared the traditional view of the author of the Pentateuch; for in matters of human knowledge Jesus, the New Testament writers, and the Church have never claimed absolute authority for themselves; nor is it part of their profession." 2) And Köhler, who was considered one of the very most positive critics of modern times, who also in his thorough "Lehrbuch der Biblischen Geschichte Alten Testaments" (Textbook of the Biblical History of the Old Testament) often quite admirably refutes the Radical critics of modern times, nevertheless also says in his last writing:

"There is no lack of those who assert the authority of Jesus against every result of Old Testament criticism that deviates from the conventional views, as if he had judged differently in these questions. In this way they exert on anxious minds an all the greater influence.

1) "Introduction to the Old Testament." Fourth edition, p. 23 f.
2) "Hand Commentary on the Old Testament." General Introduction to the Hexateuch, p. 251.

The more certain it is to the Christian that his religious life is founded in Jesus Christ, and therefore the authority of Jesus must be regarded as an unbreakable norm for his religious conviction of faith. Others, on the other hand, who for the sake of truthfulness believe that they must hold fast to those results of criticism, but who likewise consider them to be in contradiction with the utterances and views of Jesus, sometimes allow themselves to be determined by this to reduce the religious authority of Jesus. It is therefore worthwhile to see whether and what authority Jesus claims in these questions, and what position, therefore, the Christian, for whom Jesus is the highest and absolute standard in matters of faith, must take in the historical-critical examination of the Old Testament." And in another place he says: "It is a trivial truth, which nevertheless cannot be emphasized strongly enough, that Jesus did not come into the world also for the purpose of instructing men about the things of natural life, but exclusively for the purpose of making sinners God's children. Accordingly, it did not belong to his task to instruct men about the course of Israelite history as such, or about the human origin of the source Scriptures from which information about this could be obtained, but only to point out to them the source from which they could come to know God's revelations, and, according to circumstances, to present God's revelations from it to his people." And later on, "The advocates of the supposition that direct revelation is the source (of biblical prehistory) regard as its recipient, as a rule, the author of the Pentateuch, and almost universally believe, on the authority of Jesus, that Moses must be regarded as such. But the question of the name of the author of a biblical book belongs ... belongs to the sphere of natural knowledge, about which it was not part of Jesus' calling to salvation to give men information. . . Jesus calls the Pentateuch, where he refers to it in his speeches, the Book of Moses (Marc. 12, 26. Luc. 16, 29.); but he does not do it to instruct about its author, but in connection with the then common name of the Pentateuch. However this designation may have originated, and however Jesus may have judged its meaning and its justification, he could make use of it in his relations to the Pentateuch just as easily as we do, for example, of the apostolic faith. of the Apostles' Creed and of the Apostolic Constitutions, although we know perfectly well that neither the one nor the other was written by the Apostles; and he had to make use of them if he did not want either to become incomprehensible to his contemporaries or to overstep the bounds of his calling as Savior by teaching about natural things. Who wrote the Pentateuch can only be ascertained by a historical investigation of its contents and form, in which it is of the greatest weight that he himself had no part in any of its writings.

The only passage, not even Ex. 17, 14. Deut. 31, 9. 24., makes any claim to be finely composed as a whole by Moses." 1)

These statements, which could easily be multiplied from recent critical works, clearly show how the "believers" among the critics strive to eliminate the testimony of the New Testament, especially the testimony of Christ, in a good manner. With the testimonies of the Old Testament they think they can sooner come to terms. 2) But here are the words of Jesus, the Son of God, which cannot or will not be called forgeries, and they are so clear, so round, so definite, that nothing can be done with the wording. There, then, the critics have sought various evasions, and it will not be superfluous if we examine these a little more closely. From the time of the Arminian rationalist Clericus until recent times, as the above-mentioned sayings testify, people have wanted to cut off the troublesome appeal to the authority of Christ with the objection that Christ did not come into the world to instruct people on questions of biblical criticism. He had much more important things to do. That is why Christ's statements about the authors of biblical books, made in passing, are not authoritative and should not be included here. The Lord had simply joined and accommodated himself to the prevailing opinion among the Jews, and had spoken of the Torah in the same way as the Jews spoke at that time, who considered Moses to be the author of the Pentateuch. 3) And if we then question the critics a little more closely, one of them, together with Köhler, leaves open the possibility that Christ may well have known better for his own person, but that it was not his task to correct the erroneous opinion of the Jews on this point; and the other openly leans toward the view that Christ himself did not know better, since in such things he was insensitive.

1) "On the Justification of the Criticism of the Old Testament." pp. 6. 9. 12 ff.

2) Cf. Strack's critical violence, May issue of "Lehre und Wehre", p. 138 ff.

3) Dr. S. Davidson, a well-known English critic, once wrote in the journal "Hebraica" (V, 102): "Christ did not meddle with critical questions connected with the Old Testament, as His mission was of another character; He simply acquiesced in the current views of such questions as long as they did not affect the nature of that mission"; and another English critic, Prof. W. H. Bennett, wrote last year in the "Expositor" (XI, 143): "Imagine some one-singularly lacking all sense of fitness or proportion-asking Christ or St. Paul, 'Are we to understand that it is part of your inspired message that every word in the current text of the Book of Isaiah was written by that prophet, and every word in the Pentateuch by Moses?' You claim to speak in God's name, and you say you are inspired by His Spirit, do you stake your authority on the exact and literal accuracy of your language in these matters?' One can imagine Christ's indignant answer, 'Man,' He said once, 'who made me a ruler or divider?' 'Man,' He might have answered, who made me a *higher critic?* '"

as Strack's words show, who is completely in the modern-Kenotic error. - To be sure, Christ was not born to engage in higher criticism. He is, as the reformed theologian Witsius once replied to Clericus, not a teacher of criticism; but he is and remains a teacher of truth. 1) He was born and came into the world to bear witness to the truth, Joh. 18, 37. He is αλήθεια, the truth, the truth par excellence, Joh. 14, 6. But if he is the truth, then he can speak only the truth, and that everywhere and at all times, even when he speaks of the author of a biblical book. Even in such things, as the newer theologians are fond of saying, of secondary importance, he did not conform to the general ignorance and favor error; much less was he himself subject to error in these pieces. In the words of Christ, in the words of Scripture, it is altogether unseemly to contrast matters of salvation and secondary matters, and, moreover, the very context of the main passage, John 5:46 f., in which Jesus most definitely says, "Moses wrote of me," shows that it is a matter there of a truth of salvation, of the acknowledgment of his deity and of faith in his word. What Strack and Köhler put forward are nothing but cover-ups and distortions, calculated to confuse the readers. Just notice their words and their procedure. Strack cites Joh. 5, 46. f. He does not want to ignore this main passage. Yes, he then even presents himself as quite orthodox, when he first remarks that the authority of the Lord is to be regarded as absolutely sufficient and decisive. Now it would have been his duty to deal with this passage and to show why, in his opinion, it could not be decisive, for instance, to show that not all that is held to be his Scripture, etc., comes from Moses. Instead of this, we hear only the general, pathos-ridden sentence: "Who can believe-that with such a statement the difficult, intricate problem of Pentateuch criticism has been solved? And the formula sounds downright ridiculous,

1) "To be sure, Christ and the apostles were not teachers of criticism, which is what those who nowadays claim for themselves the possession of learning in every science would have us believe; but they were teachers of truth, and did not allow themselves to be deceived either by the general ignorance or by the shrewdness of the nobles. They certainly did not come into the world favoring general error, and by their authority fortifying it, and spreading it far and wide, not only among the Jews, but also among the nations, who alone depended upon them." (Enim vero non fuere Christus et Apostoli *Critices doctores*, quales se haberi postulant, qui hodie sibi regnum literarum in quavis vindicant scientia; fuerunt tamen *doctores veritatis*, neque passi sunt, sibi per communem ignorantiam aut procerum astum imponi. Non certe in mundum venere, ut vulgares errores faverent suaque auctoritate munirent, nec per Judaeos solum sed et populos unice a se pendentes longe lateque spargerent.) (,,Miscellanea sacra", I, 117.)

into which Strack then dresses the word of JEsu, if it should have been truthful. It is good that the Lord did not live on earth in the 19th century, in the golden age of higher criticism. 1)

Köhler's argumentation is no better. He, too, avoids the point when he represents in the cited New Testament passages an accommodation of Christ to the common conception of the Jews. If Jesus had really conformed to the erroneous opinion of the Jews of that time about the origin of the Pentateuch, although he knew better, then he could, indeed should, have sought another expression than this: "Moses wrote of me"; neutral expressions would have been available to him. But when he says, "Moses wrote, he wrote of me; if ye believe not his writings," it cannot be otherwise understood than that Christ himself was convinced, and wished to say so, that the writings under Moses' name were really written by Moses. Consider: The Lord wants to persuade the Jews to believe him as the truthful one. And in so doing, he was to tell them of a gross error, and say, "Moses' writings," while he knew that they were not Moses' - that is already psychologically unthinkable, apart from the fact that this whole theory of accommodation is wrong and justly theologically infamous. In the same way, the Lord had to express himself differently than: "Moses wrote by me," if he did not want to pass any judgment at all on the question of who wrote the five books. But Köhler's appeal to the apostolic symbol as an analogue is only intended to throw sand in the eyes of the simple-minded. Certainly, we still speak of the "apostolic symbolism," although we know with thousands and thousands,

1) As further evidence of how unscientifically a "scientific" critic can proceed in this matter, and how quickly and confidently he can write a false assertion into the world, let the following be communicated. A number of years ago Prof. Dr. Stevens of Yale University, an American critic, published in a then widely circulated journal an article on "The Bearing of New Testament Statements upon the Authorship of Old Testament Books." He discussed the passages under consideration, classified them, and as a result of his investigation asserted in emphatic print: "*There is not a passage* (unless an exception be made in favor of Mark 10:5)" - which passage, however, he does not recognize as original - "*in which Christ explicitly states that Moses wrote a single verse of the Pentateuch*." In the following number, after a number of readers had come forward, he had to announce: "In the collation of passages in my recent article ... I inadvertently omitted a passage of importance: John 5, 46. 47." So the very main passage, which he himself admits some might regard as "a valid exception to my statement," he has inadvertently omitted. I wonder if the critics' statements are always the results of their investigations, and if the result is not often already known before the investigation? (Cf. "The Old Testament Student" VIII, 168. 202.)

that it was not written by the apostles, as was formerly supposed. But would any one who is of our opinion, or who does not wish to pass judgment on the question of the origin of the Apostolicum, ever so express himself? The apostles wrote, "And to Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who is conceived of the Holy Ghost," etc.? Certainly not. But at that time, in the time of Christ, all the Jews believed, as friend and foe admit, that the Torah was written by Moses. Christ confirms once over another by His words this assumption, and says here in particular quite definitely and unequivocally, "Moses wrote of Me." No assertion of power on the part of critics, such as this, that the calling of Jesus as Savior did not permit it, can remove the fact that Jesus, according to the report of the Gospels, judged that the books of Moses were written by Moses, and also announced this judgment and said and taught who the author of the Pentateuch was. We cannot avoid the alternative: either Christ was right and the Pentateuch was written by Moses, or Moses did not write the writings that go under his name and Christ was - mistaken. Where this latter assumption leads, we need not elaborate here.

Another excuse of the critics is that they say: "Christ considers Moses to be the author of the Pentateuch; at least this is the premise of his words. But what has this to do with faith in Christ, with faith in salvation? It is no disparagement of the authority of Christ, no attack on faith, if one disagrees with the Lord on the question of the origin of the Pentateuch. This is a favorite argument of the "positive" critics in order to appease the minds of believing pastors who, because of the radical tendencies of today's criticism, become restless and protest against the theological professors at the universities and their denial of the biblical authors. Again and again it is asserted that faith has nothing to fear from the so-called positive criticism of our day, since faith in salvation in Christ is independent of the various answers to the question of the origin of the Pentateuch, of the second part of Isaiah, etc. This argument has already been put forward by De Wette and his colleagues. This argument has already been brought by De Wette, one of the arch-fathers of today's negative criticism. He says quite bluntly: "Not according to the results of an unbiased examination of these books, but merely for the love of tradition, some still consider Moses to be the author, because the Jews . . . have this opinion, and it also seems to be presupposed in the New Testament; but such a prejudice has absolutely no weight in criticism. Faith in Christ cannot set a limit to critical research, otherwise it would be an obstacle to the knowledge of the truth; nor does it concern such historical and philosophical questions as Moses.

critical objects." 1) Certainly, the question of who is the author of the Pentateuch does not at first touch the foundation of the saving faith. We hold that we are saved by faith in Christ, and not by the belief that Moses was the writer of the five books which are appended to him. And yet this question may also have a great deal to do with the faith of salvation. For if I deny Christ's clear and definite statements, if I consider him to be a savior subject to error, if I suppose that he spoke something that is not true, either knowingly or unknowingly, if I contradict the unanimous testimony of all the sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and accuse the Bible, which is inspired by God the Holy Spirit, of error, then faith is touched very closely. The denial of the Mosaic version of the Pentateuch, the abandonment of the untruthfulness of Scripture, and the momentous kenotic error that Christ was not omniscient in the days of his flesh, thus attacking the true deity of Christ, go hand in hand not only with Strack.

Another excuse to avoid the troublesome testimony of the New Testament is to say that when Christ or Paul say, "Moses writes," it is just as much as "the law says," "it is written in the law," a citation formula that is also found elsewhere in the New Testament, e.g., 1 Cor. 14:34. Moses" simply stands for "law"; the law is called "Moses" because Moses is the mediator of the law, and nothing is said about the authorship of the Pentateuch. This is the argument of the positive critics, who do not wish to accuse Christ of error or untruth; Volck, among others, argues in one of his latest writings. He refers to the passage Apost. 15, 21, where the Pentateuch is called Moses, and remarks: "The Pentateuch grew out of the records of Moses, the mediator of the law contained in it, the main character of the history recorded in it, hence it bears the name Moses. In such circumstances I must still maintain that the investigation of the manner of Moses' involvement in the writing of the Pentateuch is not bound to the New Testament statements." 2) Now it may well be admitted that in some places "Moses" simply denotes the law, the Pentateuch, e. g. in the very passage referred to by Volck, Apost. 15, 21: "Moses hath from long ages been preached in all the cities that preach it, and is read every Sabbath day in the schools." Cf. also 2 Cor. 3, 15. But surely this interchange is only possible and intelligible on the supposition that Moses is the author and writer of the law which is read aloud, wherein at the time

1) "Textbook of Historical-Critical Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament." Seventh edition, p. 203 f.

2) "Christ's and the Apostles' Position on the Old Testament." P. 23 f.

Christ and the apostles all agreed. And above all, this evasion fails because of the main passage Joh. 5, 46. f. which is now repeatedly touched upon. For there "Moses" cannot be exchanged with "law", but the writer of the law, Moses, and his writings, the five books, are placed next to each other and thus distinguished.

Summa, if anything is clear and certain, it is this: The New Testament, nay, all the sacred Scriptures, designate Moses as the author of the Pentateuch, and even in this point the Scriptures cannot and must not be broken. L. F.

(To be continued.)

(Submitted.)

Conversion alone God's work of grace.

"But that a man cannot of himself understand and comprehend the mysteries of God, if they be presented unto him out of the word of God, which pertaineth unto the power of the natural understanding, apart from the illumination of the Holy Ghost, is easily proved from the word of God. 001 Paul clearly confirms this to us: 'But the natural man heareth not of the Spirit of God: it is foolishness unto him, and cannot discern it: for it must be spiritually directed.' For what is foolishness to the natural man, and what he cannot discern, that man by his natural powers cannot in and of itself understand, comprehend, and accept, when it is outwardly interceded to him in the Word of God. But the divine mysteries of faith are foolishness to the natural man, and he cannot know them. For this reason man cannot understand, comprehend, and know the divine mysteries of faith in and for himself, when they are outwardly brought to him in God's Word. The first proposition is in itself bright and clear. For what a man understands and believes to be true, or, as Schmalzius says, to be wisdom itself, he must be able to discern when it is taught; he need not believe it to be foolishness. That also by the natural man here is understood the man as he is in himself, according to his natural understanding, insofar as he is still apart from the gracious illumination of the Holy Spirit, is partly given by the word in himself, which in the basic text means as much as the man according to his soul, or according to the powers of his soul, considers himself, and partly by the contrast of the natural man and the spiritual man, who has the Spirit of God. The epilogue is no less clear. For what else does Paul understand by those things which are of the Spirit of God, but those things which he taught there to be in the divine preaching, 1 Cor. 1:18-29, by which it pleased God to make blessed all them that believe, which are in the Spirit of God?

This is the sermon he holds in one sum when he calls it the word of the cross and writes about himself: "I thought not that I knew any thing among you, save Jesus Christ crucified," 1 Cor. 2:3. Of these Paul says, not only that the natural man cannot hear, but also that he cannot know them at all, yea, that it is vain foolishness for him to hear them. And he adds the reason: "Because they must be judged spiritually;" therefore for the second we conclude: He that cannot be spiritually judged cannot hear the spiritual things of faith, which are interceded in the Gospel. Now the natural man cannot judge spiritually, for he is only carnally minded in himself. He is not spiritual, therefore he cannot judge spiritually. He that hath not received the Spirit of God cannot judge spiritually: for as no man knoweth what is in God, except the Spirit of God; so no man can understand, or judge spiritually and properly, except he that hath received the Spirit of God. Now he alone teaches to judge spiritual things spiritually, as Paul teaches and proves there, v. 13. 3. That which the world holds to be foolishness man cannot of himself understand, comprehend, and accept with faith. But the doctrine of faith, and of the saving knowledge of Christ, the world in its wisdom reckons as foolishness. The word of the cross is foolishness to them that perish. For it is written: I will make void the wisdom of the wise, and the understanding of the prudent will I reject.' Because the world by its wisdom knew not God in his wisdom, it pleased God by foolish preaching to save them that believe. But we preach Christ crucified, which is an offence to the Jews, and a foolishness to the Greeks, 1 Cor. 1: Whereunto all the world offendeth, that we and all men should therefore be saved from death, and obtain eternal life; that Christ was crucified for us, that Christ should suffer in our stead, and that we which believe these things should thereby not only escape death, but be eternally saved. Then the Jews are vexed, and the Greeks think it vain foolishness, when it is announced to them that they shall not be enlightened and converted by the grace of God. 004 The wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God, saith Paul Romans 8:5 For whatsoever exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and is taken captive under the obedience of Christ, and is cast away in the suggestions thereof, cannot of itself receive and understand the saving knowledge of God, and the faith of Christ, which is the obedience of Christ; but is rather contrary unto it. But now our reason rises up against the knowledge of God, and must be taken captive under the obedience of Christ, and be cast out in its attempts, as Paul teaches in 2 Cor. 10:5: 'The weapons of our knighthood are not carnal, but mighty for God, that we might destroy the attempts and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God.'

(6) Our understanding is darkened by nature, we are alienated from the life that is of God through the ignorance that is in us, through the blindness of our heart, Eph. 4:18, we are darkness by nature, Joh. 1:5, Eph. 5:8, before our eyes are opened and we are converted from darkness to light, Acts 26:28, 1 Pet. 2:9. 26:28, 1 Peter 2:9: But they that are blind spiritually, and whose understanding is darkened, cannot discern, understand, and comprehend spiritual mysteries, except they be enlightened, and converted from the marvelous light. 7. 007 Wherefore it is necessary that God give us the spirit of wisdom and revelation unto his own knowledge, and to enlighten the eyes of our understanding, Eph. 1:17, 18. 008 Faith is the work of God, as Christ teacheth Joh. 6:29: This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent? God works faith, says Paul Col. 2, 12. item: "It is given unto you for Christ's sake to work that ye believe on him," Phil. 1, 29. God must begin and accomplish the good work of faith in us, Phil. 1, 6. God must work in us both to will and to do according to his good pleasure, Phil. 2, 13. But that which is God's work, and which God alone worketh, beginneth, and accomplisheth in us, cannot by any means be imputed to any natural powers of man. (9) No man can be called Lord without the Holy Spirit, as Paul teaches in 1 Corinthians 12:3. (10) If the knowledge of God and Christ, and the faithful acceptance of them, comes only from the divine revelation, which is full of grace, man cannot accept it from himself, and believe it by his own natural powers. But Christ teaches this, that it comes from divine, grace-filled revelation alone, Matth. 11, 25: "I praise thee, O Father and Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Yea, Father, for it hath been well pleasing in thy sight? No one knows the Son but the Father, and no one knows the Father but the Son, and to whom the Son wills to reveal it," Matt. 16:17. Flesh and blood has not revealed it to you," says Christ to Petro, when he confessed him, saying: 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God/ 'but my Father which is in heaven.'" (Abrah. Calovii Scripta Anti-Sociniana, Pars III, p. 144 sq.)

"Although it is beyond all doubt that man and the human will are required for conversion, this is by no means a real or contributory cause of conversion, but only the matter and the subject in which the Holy Spirit works conversion. The will of man is converted by the Holy Spirit. But he does not convert himself, nor work in his conversion, either in the beginning, or means, or accomplishment of it; but the whole work of conversion is one and only a work of grace of the Holy Spirit." (Ibid., p. 306.)

"Although we readily admit that man by natural powers can use the outward means belonging to conversion, such as going to church, hearing God's Word, and diligently attending to it, yet we cannot ascribe the inward parts of our conversion, the enlightenment of the mind, the stirring of the heart, and thus the really powerful conversion to God, to our powers in one and the same way or manner. Nor can we approve that for these spiritual effects in us some piety of mind or peculiar diligence to do God's will should be required beforehand, much less that such should work or create anything in our conversion, which is God's work alone, as has been proved and demonstrated before. Thus it is not in our natural powers and faculties to hear God's word, that it may be received with faith and obedience, and that we may make a resolution to do God's will. It is true that at times the unregenerate love to hear God's word, but either because of the outward gifts of the preachers, or because of carnal desire, as Herod loved to hear John the Baptist, Marc. 6, 20." (Ibid., p. 307 f.)

"But though we may reject the gospel, yet it is not in our power to receive it by faith, or to believe the gospel by the powers of our own free will; neither is there in us any godliness, or desire and love of good, before we believe, which could be a cause and ground of faith: for of such powers of the free will, of such natural godliness, and such a cause of faith in us, there is nothing to be found in God's word, wherefore to think all this a poem of Socini. He refers to Christ's word Joh. 3, 21. But there is nothing of this kind to be read. Nor does it speak of the cause of faith, but in part introduces the cause of unbelief, that men love the darkness of error and sin more than the light, which their evil works, as works of darkness, sufficiently prove; Remembering, in part, how the ungodly and impenitent shun the light, and come not to the light; whereas they that do the truth, the faithful and holy ones of God, by no means shun the light, but come to the light with their works, because they are done in God. But what is this to Socini's doctrine? Socinus also argues that unbelievers would not be guilty if none of those to whom the gospel is preached could believe. But the guilt consists in their rejecting the gospel through unbelief and resisting the Holy Spirit, who wants to work faith in their hearts. But from this it can by no means be concluded, as if it were in their capacity and free will, that they believe and accept the gospel; for one thing is to reject the gospel, another to accept it by faith." (Ibid., p. 433.)

Literature.

Dr. Martin Luther's sämmtliche Schriften, edited by Dr. Johann Georg Walch. Twenty-first volume. Luther's letters, together with the most important letters addressed to him, and some other strikingly interesting writings. First part: letters from the year 1507 to 1532. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. 1903. XL pages (preface and table of contents) and 1791 columns (text). Bound in sheepskin. Price: $3.75.

The St. Louis edition of Luther's works offers a collection of Luther's letters in chronological order. The present volume contains the first half, the letters from 1507 to 1532. The reading of this volume will be of great benefit to the reader. Luther's letters are, as it were, Luther's history of the Reformation. At the same time, they provide a deep insight into Luther's heart and mind like no other writing. Finally, they also form a rich treasure trove for theology with its questions. F. B.

Conversion and Election by Grace. Part Two: Election by Grace. Explained for every Christian from the Scriptures by C. M. Zorn, pastor of Zion Lutheran Church at Cleveland, Ohio. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. 1902. 100 pages 9X6. Price, 30 cents. Together with the first part, stiff paperback: 50 cents.

The first part of this excellent monograph has already been published in "Lehre und Wehre". We recommend the serious study of this work just now, for two reasons. First, because in recent times, from all sides, in Germany and America (in America especially from the papers of the Iowa and Ohio Synods and the General Council), equally fanatical and unjust attacks have been made on the Missouri Synod and its doctrine of conversion and election by grace. Next, because the doctrine of conversion and election of grace was the subject of the last free conference at Watertown, and will probably remain the principal subject of the intended free conference at Milwaukee. F. B.

Life of Luther, with several introductory and concluding chapters from General Church History. By GUSTAV JUST. Translated from the German by S. and H. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. 103 pages. Bound in cloth. Price, 25 cts.

This is a good, smooth translation of the German "Lutherbuch", which has met with such general and well-deserved approval. F. B.

Theologia or The Doctrine of God. Outline notes based on Luthardt. By Revere Franklin Weidner, D. D., LL.D.-Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago.

This book, which deals with theology in the strict sense, consists of numerous thoughts loosely joined together. A string of pearls, often without a string. But it is not just a string of pearls that is strung together here. Thus we read, for example, p. 80 f.: "That these creation days were long periods, and not simply solar days of twenty-four or twelve hours, is confirmed by a variety of considerations." "Aided by the light derived from geology, chemistry, physics, and astronomy, we may distinguish, in the gradual formation of the physical globe before the introduction of life, four periods: 1. the nebulous state; 2. the mineral incandescent; 3. the period of the hot oceans; 4. the period of cold oceans." "Five great ages of life may be distinguished: 1. The age of invertebrate animals in the Silurian rocks. 2. the age of fishes, in the Devonian series. 3. the age of first plants, in the Carboniferous rocks. 4. the age of reptiles, in the Mesozoic rocks. 5. the age of mammals, in the Tertiary rocks, which is closed by the age of man, in the Quarternary or present age." - The author has compiled a lot of material in 143 pages in small print. Less would have been more. F. B.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The free conference of Watertown. In the "Lutheran" of May 14, ?. Nicum published an account of the Watertown Conference, in which, among other false assertions, it was stated that Missouri had modified its position in Watertown, and in particular had rejected an election to the faith. Although this report, according to which about 150 representatives of the Synodal Conference have dropped a doctrine which they have held and advocated for decades, round and round and full, bore the stamp of the fairy-tale and fabulous on its forehead, and "Lehre und Wehre" countered it in good time, already in the May number, many church papers nevertheless "fell for" the clumsy distortion of the "Lutheran. We have encountered Nicum's presentation, for example, in the "Lutheran Herald" from the New York Ministry, in the "Church Journal" of the Iowa Synod, in the "Lutheran Observer" of the General Synod, in the "Church Journal" of the Canada Synod, in the "Augustana Journal" of the Augustana Synod, and most recently also in the "Luthardtsche Kirchenzeitung" of June 26. In the July number of the "Lutheran Church Review" Fr. Nicum now brings a second report on the events in Watertown, in which he at the same time defends his report in the "Lutheran". "In our opinion" - he says - "the reports published by the Missouri papers do not do justice to the results of the convention in this respect." But that Father Nicum's report in the "Lutheran" is wrong is not only asserted by "Lehre und Wehre," but is also testified to by other papers. The "Ev.-luth. Gemeinde-Blatt" from Wisconsin writes on June 15: "We take the liberty of remarking, however, that the rest of P. Nicum's report is factually incorrect throughout." P. Allwardt, in the "Theologische Zeitblätter" for July, makes a similar judgment. He writes, for example: "The general opinion had been gained that an agreement on the doctrine of election by grace was possible, and therefore at the beginning of the last session it was decided to hold a second meeting in the autumn. But no real conclusion had yet been reached on any point. . . . At my suggestion it was then decided that in any reports there should be no mention of a victory." "And indeed, Prof. Pieper formally retracted nothing, nor did we declare that we were now satisfied. And I think that, under the circumstances, Prof. Pieper could not well avoid opposing the report of the 'Lutheran'; I therefore do not reproach him for it." In the same number of the "Theologische Zeitblätter," Prof. Stellhorn shows that even in the five main points of the paper published in the "Lutheran," which Prof. Pieper delivered at Watertown, there is a doctrine which Ohio rejects. Yes, Father Nicum himself states in the "Lutheran Church Review" that his report in the "Lutheran" was wrong in the main. According to Fr. Nicum's report in the "Lutheran", Prof. Pieper in Watertown had rejected an election to the faith. Father Nicum's report in the "Church Review," on the other hand, says: "He (Prof. Pieper) said: Whilst on the one hand Scripture, indeed, teaches that acceptance of grace, conversion, justification, sanctification, preservation to the end, and salvation, are the *fruit of election*, and that none others are saved except the elect, this election must, on the other hand, not be sundered from the order of salvation." Father Nicum should have confessed what he actually admits in as many words. We Missourians are not indifferent to what is said in matters of doctrine.

spread about us in the world. We consider every false doctrine to be a grave sin, and when the false doctrine is imputed to us without reason, that it is wrong to speak of an election to the faith, we feel this to be slander. How one is to explain Father Nicum's conduct psychologically, we leave undecided. Let us note only two things: 1. that Father Nicum, even in his article in the "Lutheran Church Review," betrays at every turn that he does not know what Dr. Walther and the Missouri Synod have ever taught about conversion and election by grace; 2. that in his reports Father Nicum tears sentences out of their objective context and explains and exploits them according to his subjective ideas and desires. The second free conference decided upon is to be held in Milwaukee from the 9th to the 11th of September. F. B.

"Theologische Zeitblätter" and "Lutheran Standard" against each other. The "Lutheran Standard" of 27 December 1902 says of Fr. Kügele's "Country Sermons," especially of the sermon for the third Sunday after Easter on the election of grace: "We are especially pleased with the way in which our author (Fr. Kügele) handles the subject of election in his sermon for the third Sunday after Easter." "O that such preaching and teaching had always and everywhere prevailed. Then there would have been no election controversy to disturb and rend our beloved Church." From this, of course, the readers of the "Lutheran Standard" had to conclude that Missouri no longer preached what it had formerly taught, and thus now actually proved Ohio right. In February and April of the same year the "Lutheran Standard" had not merely insinuated this, but explicitly stated it. In the February number: "Missouri does not preach the doctrine which it advocated twenty odd years ago." And in the March 1 number, "8tandard" answers "Yes" to the question, "Is the meaning that they (Missouri) still hold the erroneous doctrine, but do not publicly declare it from their pulpits?" - The same sermon of Father Kügele, however, which the "Standard" praises as genuinely Lutheran and Ohioan and cites as an example of the fact that Missouri no longer preaches as it did twenty years ago, is now described by the "Theologische Zeitblätter" for May of this year as "false and un-Lutheran, contrary to Scripture and confession. From the same it is evident 'that the author is not Lutheran in the doctrine of election by grace, but neo-Missourian'. Among others, the following sentences are described as "neo-Missourian": "Stated in short words it (the mystery in God's election) is this: God wants all men saved and yet chose some men unto salvation; or, God chose unto salvation without passing the others by; or, God chose some and rejected none." "When it comes to the question: How did God manage to choose some without passing by the others ? that is asking a solution of the mystery itself, and this I cannot give." The "Time Sheets" thus conclude, "In the introduction of the present sermon, in the answer which the author gives to the question, 'What is the mystery in God's election?' lies the whole leaven of the Missourian doctrine of the election of grace." We cannot understand, therefore, how the reviewer of the present sermon could write in the 'Lutheran Standard' of December 27, 1902: 'We are especially pleased with the way in which our author handles the subject of election in his sermon for the third Sunday after Easter.' . . . Should he perhaps not have read the introduction to this sermon? In it the author shows himself to be a true Missourian. The whole sermon on the right use of the doctrine of election is based on the New Missourian and not on the Lutheran doctrine." - The same sermon, then, which the "Standard" praises as genuinely Lutheran and Ohioan, the "Zeitblätter" condemn as un-Lutheran.

and "neo-Missouri"! How is this explained? 1. by the assumption, admittedly somewhat desperate, that the writer in the "Standard" has not read the sermon in question; 2. by the improbable assumption that the "Standard" really agrees with the Missouri sermon and not with the judgment of the "Zeitblätter"; Z. by the assumption that the writer in the "Standard" knew neither what Missouri, nor what Ohio, nor what he himself teaches about the election of grace. We think the last assumption is the correct one, and that the writer in the "Standard" has not a few comrades among those who take up the pen against Missouri, especially in his own Synod.

F. B.

The General Council Seminar at Mount Airy was attended by only 50 students during the current school year. Compared with former times, this is a decrease of nearly 50 per cent. According to the "Church Magazine," Dr. Jacobs attributes this phenomenon to several causes. He says: First, only a few students from the South and West come to Mount Airy; they now mostly turn to the seminaries in Chicago and Charleston; also, students coming directly from Germany no longer enter Mount Airy, as often happened in the past. On the other hand, the demands made on those seeking admission at Mount Airy have become more and more rigorous, so that now no one can be admitted there who has not completed a college course. Only a few years ago, the number of beneficiaries was 57 (more than 50 percent of the total number), now only 17. Instead, the number of students, who come from educated and well-off families, has grown in a pleasing way. On the whole, therefore, one should not conclude from the decline in frequency an increasing aversion or indifference to the service of the Word in the circles of the General Council. F. B.

Communion Cup. The doctrine of health is used as an argument against drinking from a cup during the Lord's Supper. How inconsistent and foolish this is is shown by an expert opinion of the theological faculty of Mount Airy, from which the "Luth. Kirchenblatt" reports the following: "Up to now, not a single case of infection or transmission of disease through communion has been proven; just as little as drunkenness of individuals can be attributed to the consumption of wine in communion. The modern fear of bacilli in communion is based only on hypotheses. If one were to take the same precautions in everyday traffic life that one proposes for communion, one would arrive at an impracticable system of Jsolir. We lead in crowded tram cars, where the atmosphere is often appalling, we do this fourteen times a week, and now we refuse to put the cup to our lips once or four times a year. Our public drinks soda water all summer long from glasses that are often carelessly washed, perhaps from glasses that have never been cleaned. What kind of water is there in the bowls in which these soda-water glasses are rinsed, dozen after dozen? There one drinks the whole glass empty, but refuses to enjoy a sip of communion wine from the common cup. We went to inns, ate from plates that others had touched, drank from cups that the black attendant had just held in his hand; all this without the slightest thought of danger. In the schools the children drink from one cup, and in the railway stations the cup never comes to rest on the ice-water tank." - The Lord's Supper is and is called Communion. And this fact is symbolized precisely by drinking from one common cup. This symbolism should not fall victim to a foolish fear of bacilli. F. B.

The Canada Synod of the General Council met in Conestoga, Ont. in early June. Of 40 pastors, 28 were present and from 40 parishes only 17 lay delegates. Ten mission districts have been supported to the tune of $1980.00 during the past year. The doctrinal hearings were based on theses about the church. The tenth thesis read: "The attainment of blessedness is absolutely necessary through membership in the visible church (if one does not understand a special church community by this), is relatively necessary as a confession and because apart from the baptism of the called, there are no elect. If this is to say that membership in some visible church community is necessary for salvation, this is fundamentally false, because it would interfere with the doctrine of salvation by faith alone. Concerning the synodal authority, the following thesis was adopted: "The synod has to serve its congregations; it is not a church authority with compulsory power in the sense of a secular authority, but its decisions, born of the motive of freedom and the sense of order of the representatives of the congregations, are binding for all congregations as long as they remain in the synodal association." The Canada Synod still claims legislative power over its congregations. F. B.

The General Synod held its meeting in Baltimore in June. "Fraternal delegates" were received from the Conciliar and United Synods, and also from the Reformed and Presbyterian: Churches. Of course, the General Synod also elected "fraternal delegates" to the bodies named. Many of the non-Lutheran pulpits in Baltimore were occupied on Sunday by preachers of the General Synod. It was resolved to raise one million dollars as an educational fund. Recorded was the Synod of Southern Illinois. The Congresion of the United States was commended for adopting the "Anti Canteen Law" and declaring for closing the World's Fair on the "Sabbath." In addition, the following two resolutions were passed unanimously: "*Resolved*, That the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran church in the United States, while acknowledging the great debt owed to those scholarly investigations which have shed so much light upon the human side and origin of the Holy Scriptures, hereby expresses its unequivocal condemnation of that irreverent and destructive criticism which denies the primary agency of the Holy Spirit in their origins, which ignores their supernatural inspirations, which subjects their divine mysteries to the test of human reason, and which thereby repudiates the Scriptures as the record of a real revelation.- *Resolved*, That we congratulate the church in presenting an unbroken front on this vital question, and that the unique position she thus holds at a time when the materialistic spirit is disturbing the very foundations of other leading Protestant churches, devolves upon her not only a solemn responsibility, but also opens before her an incalculable opportunity which should quicken every Lutheran heart and inspire every Lutheran effort." The General Synod did not confess the verbal inspiration and infallibility of the whole of Holy Scripture in its resolutions. And how does the General Synod relate to its higher critic, Fr. Delk?
F.B.

The verbal inspiration is denied by the Unrighteous. The "Magazin für Ev. Theol. u. Kirche" writes in its July number: "An ecclesiastical doctrine as to how" (whether with errors and contradictions or not. F. B.) "Scripture is inspired does not exist; ecclesiastical is only that it is inspired." "In the long run, of course, the orthodox doctrine of inspiration could not possibly be reconciled with the principles of historical criticism as applied to the Bible by Simon and others.

exist together." "Accordingly, the concept of inspiration is not to be grasped as scriptural or verbal inspiration, but as personal inspiration." "Gaufsen's and Rudelbach's energetic advocacy of the strictest verbal inspiration now induced Tholuck, who had previously defended the credibility of Protestant history to a Dr. Fr. Strauss, to prove also to the other extreme the right and necessity of a freer conception of inspiration." "Now what is the result of the second phase of the struggle over Scripture? First, the insight that the old orthodox doctrine of inspiration is untenable in every respect. That the whole of scientific theology is dominated by this insight need not be particularly emphasized. . . . And it is to be hoped that the time is not far distant when this old-church theory of the dogmatists in the Protestant Church will be finally done away with." "The authority of Scripture is in the last instance the authority of Jesus Christ, of whom the Scriptures bear witness, and it belongs to every part of Scripture in the measure in which it makes Jesus recognizable to faith." - That in the above sentences the inspiration, infallibility, and authority of the whole of Holy Scripture (2 Tim. 3, 16.) is thoroughly cleared up, needs no further exposition. In its discussions the "Magazine" also extinguishes the old country lie of Luther's free position on inspiration, a lie which for decades now one theologian has thoughtlessly repeated to another without looking up Luther himself or paying close attention to his words. F. B.

Wesley's Indifferentism. The "Christian Apologist" writes on June 24: "He (Wesley) understood like no one else how to cleanse the dross from the truth of mysticism and pietism and to leave every thinking person enough room for any favorite ideas. I only recall his agreement with the Calvinist-minded Howell Harris. He could acknowledge true piety even in a Papist and Socinian. 'Is there,' he asks, in reference to Methodism, 'any other society in Great Britain or Ireland so far from bigotry, so animated by a catholic spirit, so ready to receive all serious people without distinction?' 'Does any one believe in Jesus Christ?' he remarks on another occasion, 'and does his walk conform to that confession?' These are not only the most important, but also the only questions which I ask in order to accept someone into our community.' This broad-mindedness, with all its personal fidelity to conviction, was Wesley's chief strength, the glory of his life, a chief reason of his success." - The "apologist" doesn't even realize that what he praises about Wesley is a particularly rotten spot. F. B.

Liturgy among Methodists. At the Ocean Grove Conference, the Methodists agreed upon the following order of worship: Organ prelude, singing of a hymn (standing), the Apostles' Creed, said by all, prayer with Our Father, the latter to be prayed along aloud, choral singing. Scripture reading from the Old Testament; if there are Psalms, they are read alternately; the Gloria Patri, New Testament Scripture passage, announcements, singing (standing), sermon, prayer, singing (standing), doxology. Concluding with the apostolic benediction. - The aversion among the sects to the church year with its times and feasts, to liturgical services, and to special church dress and other ceremonies is evidently on the wane. But it is foolish to see in this a special progress. To do so would be to attach an independent value to ecclesiastical forms. In many cases, the ritualistic movement among the sects is strongest where rationalism is most widespread. F. B.

Do children belong to the Church? The "Apologist" of S. June answers this question thus: "Children of believing parents who are themselves members of the church are members of the church by birth. This is not to say that children do not need to be born again. Nor is it meant to say that church membership in and of itself is sufficient for our salvation. Nor is it meant to say that these children are communicants and have the right to come to the Lord's table without preparation. We only want to give expression to the fact that our children are members of the church. A child is a member of the family in which he was born. It is not necessary to adopt the child in order to make it a member of the family. It is such by its birth.... A child is a member of the nation in which it was born. It does not need to be naturalized first, nor to declare its intention to become a citizen. It is a citizen by birth.... We believe that both the Bible and reason teach that children of Christian parents who profess to be followers of Jesus Christ are members of the Church. However, there are Christians and fellowships who want only the membership of believers to apply. To be consistent, however, they should then also insist that only adults can be family members or members of a nation. God himself has placed children in the state, the family, and the church. And if they are taken care of in the right way, they will also, when they grow up, fill their place in the state, in the family, and in the church in a worthy manner." - In order to maintain the false proposition, "Children cannot believe," the "apologist" sets up the propositions contrary to Scripture: The Church consists of believers and non-believers"; natural birth makes a child a member of the Church. Thus One error leads to many. F. B.

Baptists and conditional immortality. In Philadelphia recently a Baptist preacher from the Baptist Ministers' Association presented a paper on conditional immortality. He declared that it was unreasonable to assume eternal damnation, and that the Baptist Chicago University supported him in this. Correctly interpreted, the Bible does not teach immortality for unbelievers, but only for Christians. Christ had come to give immortality and eternal life to the pious. If the wicked died, that would be the end of them. Although the preachers present generally spoke out against this universalistic error, there was no lack of those who praised the "honesty" and "fearlessness" of this false teacher and thus, as it were, put a premium on heresy instead of branding it for what it is: a lie and godlessness. F. B.

At the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America at Asbury Park, N. J., Dr. Burrell of New York declared, "The young man who attends the Union Theological Seminary in these days and accepts what one of the instructors has recently said as to 'the absurdity of believing the Scriptural account of the supernatural birth of Jesus Christ' would be a colossal fool, in my judgment, to consecrate his life to the preaching of the Gospel." Quite true: If there is a gospel of Christ, preachers are the most necessary people in the world; but if there is no gospel of Christ, preachers are the most superfluous people in the world. Union Seminary trains preachers and then tells them that they really have nothing to preach. That is to tease the students. - That even in the Reformed Synod unbelief makes itself felt is evident, for example, from the fact that in the same Synod the words "conceived and born in sins" were deleted from the baptismal form, and the words "born in sins" were deleted from the marriage form.

Word: "be obedient". The "Independent" especially praises the latter as progress and great heroism. But even the pagans called an action that sacrifices its conviction to public opinion (arbitrio popularis aurae) disgraceful. To assert a moral demand in the face of public opinion is courage, and the opposite is cowardice. A bride who refuses the promise of obedience is rebelling against God and his clear word, and such rebels should not be cowardly backed by the church.

F. B.

Purpose of Catholic Associations. In recent years Roman priests have been working diligently to unite the Catholic associations, which already have over 3,000,000 votes, for political purposes. In Chicago, Bishop Messmer said of the purpose of the allied Catholic associations: "The Holy Father tells us that where it is necessary to defend the sacred rights of the Church, it is the duty of the Catholic citizen to interfere in politics. Where principle and prudence require it, everyone must stand up for the claims of the Church..... This is a goal our Federation must not lose sight of. Let us not deny it, and there can be no harm in our fellow citizens knowing it." However, out of "prudence," the archbishops gathered in Washington some months ago recommended that the Federation modify its political goals. How long will it be before we also have a "Centrum" in American politics? - The Catholics themselves are not unanimous on the question whether they should already appear in America as a united Catholic party or not. Some see in it a great danger, others an equally great advantage for the Church. The "Review" published in St. Louis by Preuß and the "Glaubensbote" agitate for the political activity of the Catholic associations. The Review wrote long ago: "The plans of the enemy federation are clearly political. And therefore the Catholic Federation will have to fight them on political ground. There is no way out of it at all. And that is why the Review has maintained from the beginning that a Catholic Federation which excludes politics entirely from its program and ignores it completely in its activity would be a stillborn child. If the federation is not to be the cornerstone of a Catholic centrist party - though not similar in all respects to the German centrist - it will do more harm than good and deserves to die unborn." To this the "Messenger of the Faith" expressly professed. The fact is that from the beginning the Catholic associations asserted their influence in the political field, and that the "Protective Association" in Washington created the "National Patriotic Federation," to which the "Review" refers, to protect the religious and political liberty of the country against the "Federation of Catholic Associations." But not all Catholic papers take the position of the "Review." The "Pilot" of Boston declared that the Federation of Catholic Associations was in no sense a political party. Paulists, in their monthly, "The Catholic World," spoke out against the national Federation of Catholic Associations on the ground that President Roosevelt was willing to grant Catholics anything they could reasonably ask for. "The Catholic World" wrote: "The time may come when it will be necessary for us to join together in a Catholic party, as the Catholics of Germany have done; but that time has not yet arrived. Nor is it wise to conjure up such a state of things." From this it is evident that the Archbishops in Washington have taken a middle course. They have neither advised the Catholic Associations to support the national federation-

ration, nor to abandon their political purposes. They only urge caution and moderation. The striving for worldly rule is in the blood of the Roman Church. True Catholics can no more refrain from raping others than cats can refrain from mousing. In America, too, they will tolerate anything that stands in the way of their lust for power only as long as they have to. - Of the fruits which the federation of their associations has recently brought to the Papists, the Papist paper "vominicana" writes: "It is not needful to state that since the federation movement Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia and Mr. Bonaparte of Baltimore have been appointed as the first Catholic members of the Board of Indian Commissioners; that a Catholic has been appointed Assistant Postmaster-General; that a graduate of Georgetown Catholic University has been appointed as one of President Roosevelt's private secretaries; that several Catholic chaplains have been appointed in our army; and that other well-known persons have deservedly received posts of trust. Do not these results speak louder than words, and tell us what united action,-what a federation of Catholic associations can bring about?" - The mere foretaste of approaching political violence makes priests drunk, but at the same time, like all narcotics, the more greedy for doubled doses. F. B.

"Why does Unitarianism not sweep the country?" This question was thus answered by Dr. Savage of New York in a lecture to the Unitarian Club in Boston: "For Unitarians, New York is the hardest ground I know. What stands in the way of Unitarianism in New York is the lack of religious thinking. There are certainly not 400 people in New York who are in any way seriously engaged in religious thought (who do any downright religious thinking)." **Dr.** Savage concludes thus: Those who think seriously and rightly about religion arrive at Socinianism; but these are very few: so there is little and little right thinking in the religious field, but Dr. Savage is in a great error with his syllogism. True, one does not arrive at the doctrines of Christianity by right thinking on the basis of natural facts and truths. In the spiritual sphere, even the most correct and persistent thinking never makes faith poorer or even superfluous. But only thinking that ignores the fact of an evil conscience leads to Socinianism. We cannot prove Christianity by reason, but we can prove of the Unitarian religion that it is the result of superficial thinking and false reasoning. Hegel's proposition: "Man, who has errors, is absolved of them directly by himself, inasmuch as he makes nothing of them," and Ritschl's assertion: "Justification and reconciliation consist in man's thinking God merciful," express the essence of Socinianism. These propositions, however, are not only denied by Scripture, but also by all and every reason. That the Unitarians do not grow, therefore, has its reason not, as they flatter themselves, in their strong thinking, but chiefly in the fact that every one soon perceives that, if Unitarianism is right, he has no need of a church at all. Indispensable in the world is only the church which preaches reconciliation and forgiveness in the blood of JEsu Christ, the Son of God. F. B.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis decided in Detroit to retain the Jewish Sabbath, although there was a strong current in favor of changing the celebration to Sunday for practical reasons. But in the end the Reform element remained in the minority, and after eight hours of oratory the following motion was adopted by Dr. Silvermann: "The Conference

Declares itself in favor of maintaining the historic Sabbath as a fundamental institution of the Jewish religion, pledges itself to spare no effort to bring about a better observance of the Sabbath day, and instructs the Executive Committee to appoint a Special Committee to approach the practical execution of these ideas."

"**Federation of American Zionists.**" The Zionists held their convention in Pittsburg in early June. During the past year 71 new branch societies were founded. Funds were sent to Jews persecuted in Bulgaria, Galicia and Russia. The main subject of the negotiations was the atrocities in Kishinev. Resolutions were passed against the Russian government, which had not lifted a finger to stop the acts of violence. In his greeting to the Pittsburg Convention, Dr. Herzl, the leader of the Zionists in Germany, says: "For us, the history of nations has not moved one step forward in the last 800 years. We are still in the terrible period of the Crusades, in which the pious warriors of the Cross practiced their heroic work by mass slaughter of Jews and plunder of the defenseless ghetto. Kishinev further proves that Zionism is the only way to lead our deplorable brethren in Russia and other countries away from their present hellish state." Israel Zangwill, the poet of the Ghetto, sent the following message: "Greetings to the Pittsburg Convention! The Kishinev atrocities have shown the blindest the necessity of a publicly and legally secured homestead for our unfortunate race. May the strong place of fire and steel in which you are assembled inspire you to build a great bridge over which Israel shall enter her ancient home and her glorious future." Nevertheless, it was decided at Pittsburg "that under present circumstances it would be unwise to bring the emigrating Russian Jews to Palestine, and that it would be best to provide them with homes elsewhere where they could be free from persecution." - The Jewish Colonization Association wants to transfer to the Zionists the fifty million dollars donated by Baron Hirsch for the foundation of a refuge for persecuted Jews. A bill to this effect has already passed its second reading in the British Parliament. According to this bill, the money donated by Baron Hirsch may be used "in any part of the world except Europe. In Dr. Herzl's hands there are also about ten million dollars. F. B.

Some months ago the "Congregationalist" brought views and judgments from various educators on **the subject of religious instruction in the state schools.** Hill of the Massachusetts Board of Education declared: "There is some profound and universal sense in which religion might become a theme for school consideration. . . But it is delicate ground for the school to cover." - G. Martin, superintendent of Boston schools, wrote: "In Massachusetts and Maine the state law already requires instruction in the principles of piety, justice, truthfulness, patriotism, humanity, sobriety, diligence, thrift, chastity, and temperance. And this, he said, was what was sought, "an irreducible minimum of theistic belief and altruistic ethic," and the very core of the Christian and Jewish religions. - A. E. Winship of the "Journal of Education" said that ethical instruction could be given in the state schools, but not religious instruction. - J. W. Carr, Superintendent at Anderson, Jnd. wrote: "Every public school should teach moral instruction. Religious instruction will also come, he says. "The fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the dignity of life, and the moral order of the universe."

- these are necessary subjects of instruction. - Prof. Coe of Northwestern University thinks it is time for Jews, Catholics and Protestants to come together to agree on what could be taught in public schools. "We are not as far apart as we sometimes think, but we must remove the illusion of being far apart." Good music and some liturgy would be very much in place in the schools. - A. W. Small of Chicago University writes: "If anyone thinks that the public of any single American city is ready to have anything which can possibly be constructed as sectarian, smuggled into the public schools, his experience is utterly at variance with mine." Only when all churches have united can there be any talk of religious instruction in the public schools. The verdict of F. L. Soldan of St. Louis is similar. Religious instruction could be introduced in the state schools as soon as the church communities had formulated "an irreducible minimum of theistic belief and altruistic ethic". - A. W. Edson, Superintendent of Schools in New York, argued that moral instruction was desirable, but not religious instruction. A passage from the Bible should be read daily in every school throughout the country, but without all comments and explanations. Edson gives the following example from his own experience that even Bible reading can only be a blessing if the teacher shows the right attitude. He writes: "I once heard a principal of a large school conduct the opening exercises in the following manner. He said, 'I am required to read the Bible; here goes!' He opened the Bible at random and read the first passage that his eye fell upon, which happened to be the first verse in the 14th chapter of Second Kings: 'In the second year of Joash son of Jehoahaz king of Israel reigned Amaziah son of Joash king of Judah.' He then closed the book with a slam and turned to something else."-Of all the pedagogues who speak in the "Congregationalist" none treats the question principally. Not one of them shows any understanding of the proper relationship between church and state. F. B.

Unions and Strikes. "The Anthracite Coal Strike Commission, in its ruling, rightly emphasizes that the worker has a personal right to stop work, but that it is an unlawful rape of employers and workers for strikers to prevent others from working. The judgment says: "The right to remain at work where others have ceased to work, or to engage anew in work which others have abandoned, is part of the personal liberty of a citizen that can never be surrendered, and every infringement thereof merits, and should receive, the stern denunciation of the law." Concerning the "Coal Strike" the Commission stated on the basis of numerous testimonies: "A reign of terror had been created, either by the threat of violence or by its previous use. - In St. Louis in March, Judge Adams issued the following sound ruling on strikes: "An employee has the unquestionable right to put a price on fine work, and to attach conditions to his employment, or to the continuance of his work at some future time, if he has not bound himself by obligations assumed under the contract. And if the employer does not comply with the covenants and conditions, the laborer has the manifest right not to accept the service, or, if he has already accepted it, to discontinue the work. But what one is permitted to do, all may do. As 'capita' combines for lawful purposes, so 'labor' may combine for lawful purposes. But this right of association, and the right to combine

The right to strike which results from this is a weapon for the defence and protection of the employees, and not a weapon for attack. The workers may, by peaceful and lawful combination and joint action, be able so to control the wants of labor as to compel the employer to accept their terms; but they are not at liberty to use this weapon in any other way to put obstacles in the way of or to do harm to the employer or employee. The clear line of demarcation recognized by all legal authorities is that the legal and permitted strike shall not be accompanied by acts of violence and destruction of property, nor even by coercive measures designed to prevent the employer from obtaining other laborers, or otherwise carrying on his business according to his own judgment." In New York, where the builders have been on strike for months and several "walking delegates" or "business agents", as they are now called, have been sued for blackmail by the employers, a judge declared in early July in a judgment on a striker who had tried to prevent a non-union worker from working by force: "You represent a body of men who consider themselves above the law. Every man has a right to sell his labor for what he pleases, and should not be interfered with in so doing. The question of wages is one between the employer and employed, and cannot be dictated by any body of men. The right of labor must be secured, as guaranteed by the law." - In Vermont, some weeks ago, a manufacturer was awarded damages up to A2500.00 by the court in an action against a union and its members, who had intimidated new workers after a strike by threats and thus forced the manufacturer to protect his workers and to feed them in the factory. But when the fabricant wanted to collect his money from the individual members, the books of the union had disappeared. Similar suits are pending in the courts of various states. In England, a Lord Iveagh recently succeeded in recovering the damages awarded him in such a suit from a walking delegate. - It is obvious that the judicial pronouncements referred to condemn strikes as we know them and as they are usually constituted. F. B.

II. Abroad.

Business Profit and Usury. The "A. E. L. K." writes of June 19: "The publishing house of the Missouri Synod in St. Louis was able to pay a net profit of 307,886 marks into the Synod treasury in the fiscal year ending February 1, 1903. Only 35 years ago, Prof. Walther, the head of the Missouri Synod, taught that "any taking of interest is reprehensible usury!" - A testimony to the poverty of the "A. E. L. K." that it is not able to distinguish between honest profit from honest work in a business and usurious taking of interest, where the borrowed money has brought no return. Even Dr. Walther did not reject the former, but he did reject the latter, according to God's word. F. B.

The answer of the Minister of Culture to the petition of the 193 clergy in Holstein has now been received. It is worded as follows: "Your Reverence and the other co-signers of the presentation of July 26, 1902, concerning the staffing of the theological faculty in Kiel, I refer most humbly to my statement made in the 7th session of the House of Lords on April 3, 1902, in which I explained in more detail my fundamental position on the questions touched upon in the petition. In doing so, I expressly note that I do not support the Lutheran character of the Kieler

theological faculty, as my predecessor also did by decree of May 7, 1894. Therefore, the affiliation of the respective doctor to the Lutheran confession will continue to be emphasized in every case of appointment. I am not in a position to accept the criticism of past practice made in the above submission as valid. Nor am I in a position to grant the request made at the end of the petition: that the professorship of practical theology not be entrusted to Professor Dr. Baumgarten, especially since there is no legal basis for the removal of the aforementioned from his academic teaching position. However, I am all the more pleased that, with the unanimous approval of the theological faculty, a capable teacher of practical theology has recently qualified as a professor in Kiel, through whom the positive direction in the field of practical theology will also be represented in the most extensive manner. Studt." In nuce: It remains the same! F. B.

Synodal Tasks. The "A. E. L. K." reports on the synodal task set in Bavaria for the year 1901 on "the divine and the human factor of the Holy Scriptures and their relationship to each other": "In total, **314** papers, namely **288** synodal papers and **26** printed papers were submitted. Of these, 1 were classified in the I. grade class ('excellent'), 107 in the **II.** ('very good'), 137 in the **III.** ('good'), 137 in the IV. (Of **1011** clergymen, **654** were exempt**,** i.e. approximately The remark of the Consistory, "in the future, not too easy reasons should be sought in order to obtain exemption from the preparation of a sample of scholarship", indicates spiritual apathy and theological indifference among many pastors**.** Of the content of the works the Consistory judges: "With thanksgiving to God we have perceived that the divine factor of the Holy Scriptures has not been questioned or denied by any of our clergy. Without exception, a standpoint honoring the Holy Scriptures as God's Word was evident. Admittedly, there was no lack of all kinds of concessions to the newer Bible criticism, and some went quite far in it." No one seems to have advocated verbal inspiration. It was excluded from the outset by the wording of the question asked. But what happens now to such pastors who have trotted out their unbelief and gone "quite far" in it? The Consistory writes: "May the Spirit of God succeed in making them aware of what is erroneous, wrong and questionable in their theological views. May this good Spirit of God give them strength to overcome it and to become more and more friends with the constant teachings of the fathers." Doctrinal breeding does not exist in Bavaria. F. B.

Civil burials. Fr. Lezius from Königsberg wrote: "A man like Virchow could not be buried like a dog, because he had lived as an unchristian and died as such. As a human being he had to be buried with dignity, and as a famous man with honor, if need be at the expense of the state. But that a preacher of the gospel should bless his corpse and give it its last rites was an abomination. The church may bestow its blessings only on such people as openly profess the gospel, who are members in the walk and truth of Jesus, as far as the eyes of man can discern. Whoever does not believe in Christ and keeps away from the church, the church must keep away from him when his body is buried. This the honor of Christ requires. In order that the abomination of the present burial practice may be controlled, the state must introduce the institution of a decent facultative civil burial. The civil

civil servant can perform it with the assistance of several friends of the deceased according to a solemn ritual that is easy (?) to find. The civil marriage is not inhumane, nor is the civil burial. As soon as this arrangement has been made, we have clear conditions. The Church can, without appearing intolerant or inhumane, deny ecclesiastical funerals to all atheists and the unchurched, as its duty dictates. Society and the State, on the other hand, see to it, as is equally their duty, that civilly blameless persons, according to their dignity as human beings, are decently and honorably buried." In America, too, funeral orations cause conscientious preachers much distress. In sectarian circles, the proposal has repeatedly been made to replace funeral orations with a mere liturgical celebration. The same is recommended by the "Messenger of Peace" of the Unirte. He writes: "Yes, it is true: from many a pulpit the Word of God is preached with all seriousness and conscientiousness, sin is called sin and the sinner is told with all firmness: 'If you do not convert, you will perish,' but when such a poor person dies in his sins, little or nothing of the seriousness of eternity is noticed at the grave, the funeral sermon is in contradiction with the Sunday sermon. It is unforgettable to the writer how an apparently serious-minded undertaker once complained to him that he soon no longer knew what to believe and whom to believe. This is by no means to say that righteous, competent funeral sermons are not held; certainly one can still hear such sermons; but whether they are the rule or the exception should not be difficult to determine. As things stand, however, one would prefer to see all funeral orations abolished. In our country not a few Anglo-American preachers hold only one liturgical service at a funeral. Should not one such be quite sufficient? If this custom were generally introduced, surely the Church would not suffer any harm from it, but would rather derive great benefit. Recently in Germany a faithful servant of the Lord exclaimed in deep sorrow: 'If only the Protestant churches would cease with funeral sermons! They are their ruin! They will die of it yet/ These are very words worth taking to heart." - To this we remark: Truthfulness requires that the Christian preacher deny a Christian burial to anyone who has died as a manifest unchristian. By allowing a liturgical celebration to take the place of the funeral oration, nothing essential is changed, and neither the preacher's distress of conscience nor the annoyance is thoroughly controlled. There is no middle course here between confession and denial. F. B.

The Confession of the Saxe-Weimar Regional Church. The "A. E. L. K." writes: "Herr Geh. Kirchenrath Dr. Nicolai in Altstedt (S.-Weimar) writes to us: In No. 20 of the "Allgem. Evang.-Luther. Kirchenzeitung", sp. 463, line 23 from below, the following sentence is found: "What has happened in the Saxony-Weimar Regional Church, namely, the elimination of the validity of the Lutheran confession for the entire Regional Church by unanimous resolution of the Synod and the Church Government", etc., etc., is not yet known. I remark on this as follows: In the Weimar Regional Church the symbolic books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkaldic Articles, Luther's Large and Small Catechism, and the Concordia Formula, are valid, and the Lutheran clergy are bound to these, since March 1, 1817, with the addition: "in so far as these newer writings agree with the Holy Scriptures." In the schools, Luther's Small Catechism is used, which is published with short explanations in two editions, for elementary schools and for higher schools, as a state catechism.

catechism is introduced. Weimar, H. Böhlau? We are pleased to receive this information, but we would like to briefly give the floor to our colleague: 'My statement was based on the fact that on April 29, 1870, the Grand Ducal Ministry of Culture in Weimar sent a memorandum dated March 15 to all church boards, the first section of which is dedicated to the proof that the Weimar Regional Church is no longer an exclusively Lutheran church. This view received ecclesiastical sanction through § 1 of the Synodal Ordinance of 1873, insofar as it distinguishes between "the state of confession in the Protestant Regional Church" and the state of confession of the individual congregations, which made no sense if the Protestant-Lutheran confession were authoritative for the entire Regional Church. That the Weimar Regional Church also includes Reformed and Uniate congregations cannot be denied.'" - A confession of the symbolic books of the Lutheran Church, "in so far as they agree with Scripture," is a confession which every Reformed and Papist can also make, and therefore, in essence, no confession at all. F. B.

The speech of the Prussian Minister of Culture on the question of professors is the best document to characterize the present ecclesiastical situation in Germany. Therefore, in the following we will share the main part of the speech. According to the official shorthand, the Minister of Culture, Dr. Studt, said: "Gentlemen! The principles which guide the state administration of education in filling the Protestant theological chairs of the universities were explained by me in detail in the session of the House on May 7 of last year. The position I took at that time is, as I hereby declare, maintained on this side. It is true that in the meantime certain tensions between the Church and theology, as well as within theology, have arisen anew; however, such tensions cannot be eliminated by interventions of the state administration. It is in the nature of evangelical freedom that theological research may not be called 'so far and no further'. This freedom, which has grown up with the Reformation and through the Reformation, has, I do not deny, its dangers; but these dangers must be borne in the firm confidence that everything extreme, unfruitful, and contrary to the truth will be defeated in the battle of the spirits. Intervention from without would only have the effect of gaining allies for error and increasing its tenacity. Freedom makes greater demands on the conscientiousness and restraint of the teachers of theology and on their responsibility for the service of the church. But teachers will meet them the more willingly the more securely they enjoy their freedom for serious, scholarly research. It may be trusted to the power of the evangelical spirit that all tensions and difficulties will balance themselves out again without external intervention. This marks the position of the State Government in general. My personal confessional standpoint must take a back seat to this fundamental statement. I believe, however, that I am all the more dispensed from further exposition of this position, since I may presume it to be known that I have always manifestly maintained my positive faith in the various stages of my long career as a civil servant, especially in my former position as a member of a provincial synod and a general synod." After a discussion of the proceedings at Kiel and Bonn, Dr. Studt thus concluded his address, "Gentlemen! Taken as a whole, the two abundances discussed give no cause for concern about the development of our Protestant Church. I live in the conviction that our Church

is in possession of the truth and will be victorious in this possession. In the meantime, the educational administration will continue to fill the chairs of Protestant theology, as hitherto, in full agreement with the ecclesiastical authorities, with men who combine scientific ability with a warm heart for the Protestant Church, and who are thus joyfully prepared not only to take part in the researches of science, but also to uphold the teachings of the Church. You can be assured, gentlemen, that the positive direction will not be neglected in the process!" The historically as well as theologically wrong sentence: "It is in the nature of Protestant freedom that no -to here and no further/ may be shouted to theological research" is thus in Prussia the principle for the filling of theological professorships! If Dr. Studt had wanted to assess the situation in the sense of Luther and the Reformation, he would have had to declare: "If the state taxes the liberals for the appointment of theological professors, it cannot deny them the right to help determine the character of these professors. But now that the Positives declare that this is to the ruin of the Church, the only possible solution of the question is that the State and the Church should be separated, and thus each ecclesiastical tendency may employ its own professors and train its own preachers." Lord Mayor Struckmann therefore argued, in general, quite correctly, when he declared in the Lord's House, "Gentlemen, the State Government has, however, assumed the obligation of seeing to it that the churches which are at present recognized in our! State receive from it their teachers. Therefore professors of both Catholic and Protestant theology are employed in our faculties. But, gentlemen, if it were to come to the point that the professorships were filled according to the quite one-sided respective moods and directions as they are found in exclusive parts of the church, where will and must that lead? Does the great majority of the Protestant Church, which does not share this point of view, stand completely without rights vis-à-vis the government and the state? If the government, following your call, were to employ in the Protestant faculty only those professors who take the dogma of the Protestant Church in your sense, where would that leave the rest of us, gentlemen, who do not take this stand? Have we not the right to say to the government: employ also professors who no longer have a place in the Protestant Church, which has become one-sided; we also have a religious need, we also stand on the standpoint of Christianity, and we likewise demand that our spiritual and religious needs be taken care of? Is that what you want? Or else it would have to lead to a complete separation of the church from the state. . . . If the government were so unjust as not to take into consideration the great majority of the people with regard to their religious, Christian, and scientific needs, it would not be able to carry this out in the long run; it would be compelled to create change, and this could only be done in such a way that it either employs professors of all possible directions, or else that it says: No, I thank you, we cannot do that; it is the task of the individual ecclesiastical directions and communities to see to that; we let the separation of the church from the state come into effect." Separation of the Church from the State, that is the solution of the Profestorensrage. And all interested parties could be satisfied with this solution: the liberals, for it is entirely reasonable; the positives, for it is in accordance with Scripture and confession; and the State, for in this way it would be rid of questions which it is utterly unable to solve, which drive it from one injustice to another. But of this solution no party wants to know anything, least of all.

the positives, who stand to gain the most. They believe themselves safe and secure only under the wings of the state. That is why they always crawl back to the cross when they have once given vent to their indignation against the minister of culture or the church regiment. Father Bunke of Berlin, for example, writes submissively and humbly in the "Reformation" of May 10: "One can see from this speech that the Minister of Culture personally has a full understanding for the needs of the church and the right of the believing congregation, regrets their disturbance by the 'modern-theological evangelists,' is pleased about every self-help (study house in Bonn), and accommodates the demands of the friends of the confession as far as his position within the framework of the general ministry allows him. He lets it be known that he would go even further if he were allowed to act purely according to his personal views. The Church therefore has reason to be grateful that the late Cultusminister Bosse has a like-minded successor who seeks the best of the Church out of his own conviction and with inner understanding. It may also commemorate with appreciation the man who is the right hand of the Minister in filling the theological faculties and who has met the needs of the Church with increasing benevolence in recent years, Ministerial Director Althoff. " F. B.

Of the ecclesiastical conditions in Bremen, "Der alte Glaube" (The Old Faith) writes: "It is a sad fact that the two German cities on the North Sea, the Hanseatic cities of Hamburg and Bremen, instead of being the refuge and protection of the faith with their good core of Frisian and Lower Saxon population, have become, in ecclesiastical terms, so to speak, the rejection boxes of the empire, in which it dumps the spiritual forces that have made themselves impossible in other regional churches. Thus, in the course of the last few years, Bremen's gates opened to a Weingart, a Steudel. The halo of free-minded martyrdom is sufficient to enable a preacher to take over one of the richly endowed posts of the free imperial city. The Bremen Senate does not bind the clergy to any confession. Therefore, in the churches of St. Ansgaris, Martini, Michaelis, St. Ramberti and in the venerable cathedral, we hear sermons that have nothing to do with the Christian religion. One pastor bases his Sunday sermon on a word by Goethe. Another speaks of the faith in providence of the old covenant and of "so-called Christianity" as an obsolete concept that is abundantly replaced for modern man by a loving contemplation of nature. A pastor baptizes the children of his fellow-members "in the name of God. Where, exceptionally, one is not satisfied with this, he also adds, at the special request of the parents, "in the name of Christ and the Holy Spirit. It is a shame that Protestants recognize such "baptism. The Roman Church exploits this nonsense to the utmost. It acts as if it were common in all Protestant churches, and concludes from it the right to baptize anew every Protestant who transgresses. A practice that denies the ultimate bond of unity between the churches and stamps the Protestant national churches as pagan communities. Significant was a lecture given this winter at the "Protestants' Association' by Father Burggraf, who is well known for his belletristic writings, especially "Schiller's Frauengestalten'. He took up the Emperor's words about the necessary "further education of religion," and said that only a "further education into the Germanic" could be meant. "What do we care about the history of Israel's salvation? German Christians are to be educated, prayers are to be offered to the German God! The thought must come alive: the German people is now the chosen people of God/ Burggraf also calls us to look for a 'German Christ', since that of the

Gospel was only a picture of the past. Luther resurrected it in Germany. The German Christ is our German idealism, an inwardly pressing longing, serving heaven and yet living on earth with a world-shaping creative desire in the sense of Goethe and his great kindred spirits.* In the same lecture, the ecclesiastical efforts for unity were welcomed with joy. The speaker found it especially pleasant that from Gotha, where the -great liberal General Superintendent Karl Schwarz' had worked, -the heart-satisfying conciliation* was sounding." - The faithful preachers at Bremen are Indifferentists and Unionists. F. B.

Weinel of Bonn speaks of **how the liberals think of the evangelization of the educated:** Just as the Inner Mission and the Methodist conversion movement take care of the lower circles of the people, so free theology must drive an evangelization into the circles of the educated. Of course it was not appropriate to offer the church gospel to the educated; the same was unacceptable to them. Without a clear and unambiguous pronouncement of the negations, nothing could be done. One must expressly deny the Sonship of Christ, His resurrection, the doctrine of His sacrificial death, etc., if one wants to break ground for the Gospel among the educated of the present day. The right man for this modern work of evangelization is the academic docent and not the pastor. The latter would always feel himself to be the pastor of the whole congregation; the academic docent, on the other hand, could take the educated circles on his side and tell them what was intended only for them. In time it would be achieved that for the broad mass of the people and for the educated a special pastor would be appointed. The pastor appointed for the educated would have to proceed exactly according to the method of the academic doctor who had done pioneer service for him. In other words, the educated scoffers would be evangelized in such a way that they would be led to believe that they were true Christians!

F. B.

Harnack in the eyes of the unbelievers. How the monistic philosopher Hartmann pilloried the dishonesty of the liberal theologians, we reported in his time in "Lehre und Wehre". The "Sächsische Freikirche" now brings in its number of June 21 a similar judgment on Harnack by the atheist and evolutionist Dr. J. Johannsen. The same reads thus: "The orthodox Protestant theologians reproach the liberal ones that if they do not believe in the deity of Christ, their enthusiasm for the person of Christ is untenable. This accusation is perfectly valid. What the liberal Protestant theologians sometimes say about Christ, even supposing that they consider him to be the most ideal of men, seems like a fixed idea, or like the stammerings of hysterical wenches. At first I was unable to read through Harnack's 'Essence of Christianity'; I blame it on the fact that this book forces the head to think and feel things together which have no place in one head, whereas an orthodox book about Christ does not make this difficulty; in such a book it simply says: 'Christ was God,' and then it becomes understandable if the highest veneration is offered to him and his word is regarded as eternal." And p. 171: "Harnack himself is not a pastor, but on this" (the apostolic is meant) "confession his pupils who become pastors in the Prussian Protestant State Church are bound at ordination, and it is spoken by them every Sunday at the main service with the introductory words: 'Let us in unanimity of faith with the whole of Christendom thus confess'; also at baptism, i.e. at the admission of new members into the church, it is an-

turned around. How can Harnack's students, who have adopted his objective assessment, speak these words? Only by lying through their teeth." "The employment and work of such students is based on a lie; every Sunday the lie is shouted into the house of God in a loud voice. Those liberal ministers would have to declare: I do not believe that Jesus Christ was conceived by the Holy Spirit; I do not believe that he was born of the Virgin Mary; I do not believe that he descended into hell; I do not believe that he rose again from the dead on the third day; I do not believe that he ascended into heaven.' You would have to push yourself to make this confession. I have had a confessional education through school and church; it may disgust the laity that preachers should take the liberty of solemnly preaching to us stupid people things in which they themselves do not believe."

F. B.

Modern Theology in Sweden. The ecclesiastical controversy which has broken out in Norway is also receiving continued attention in Sweden. The Stockholm Conference, in its last meeting, dealt with the attack which Bishop Heuch has directed at Klaveneß and modern theology. Bishop Heuch wants sin and grace to be fully witnessed to in the sermon. Klaveneß thinks that modern man has no understanding of the ancient doctrines of "sin," "conversion," "reconciliation," "substitution," etc. These and similar terms do not fit into the evolutionary thought that dominates modern man. Preaching must be contemporary. This means not only that the old teachings are applied to the new conditions, but also that the teachings of theology are adapted to modern science. - That unbelieving theology is spreading in Sweden is further evident from the fact that Archbishop Ekmann, in the name of all the bishops, recently addressed a letter to the theological faculty in Lund, in which he points out the increasing ignorance of the candidates in Lutheran doctrines. Although Ekmann does not seem to believe this, this contempt for Lutheran truths undoubtedly has its main reason in the fact that Wellhausen and Harnack also have their followers at the universities of Norway and Sweden. Since October 1901 a monthly journal has been published in Stockholm: "Die Fackel" (The Torch), which has made it its special task to combat the evolutionist worldview in theology and science. The very first sentence of the first issue reads: "The organ, which herewith claims its place in the free discussion, wants to form a counterweight against the more and more spreading and openly proclaimed worldview, which has found its expression in the doctrine of evolution not only within the natural sciences, but also within theology." - "Die Fackel" advocates verbal inspiration, which the "Old(?) Faith" deplores as a deficiency, and makes him agree with Ullmann's wish: "The editor (of the 'Fackel') would like to overcome his much too mechanical theory of inspiration. "F. B.

The Protestant-Lutheran Faculty in Bonn, where the unbelieving Dr. Weinel is active, now has ten full professors, one more than in Berlin. In addition, there are four associate professors and private lecturers. In the previous winter semester, 82 students were enrolled. That makes 5-5/7 students for every professor. The positive side says that critical theology, which is especially favored in Bonn, is to blame for the poor attendance. And the liberals say: the unnatural mixture of extremely liberal and orthodox theologians is to blame. The "Christi. Welt" writes: "Small faculties with a small number of students should distinguish themselves by a certain harmony in their teaching, by an educationally effective cha-

The artificial accumulation of opposites only cancels out the effect of the forces layered against each other, only serves pro nihilo; the intended preservation of the studying youth from one-sidedness is only successfully pursued by making it possible for every theology student to attend a differently oriented faculty. We therefore approve of the principle to which Greifswald owes its character - only on condition, of course, that other faculties are allowed the harmonious organization of a different spirit! In Bonn, the method of artificially forming Protestant faculties from heterogeneous elements, which is common today, has gradually brought about a true monstrosity. . . No wonder that the students become uncomfortable with this unnatural formation of faculties and prefer to turn elsewhere. Do not say that they flee the representatives of the historical-critical direction in Bonn! They could and would otherwise have to answer the appointment of conservative professors with a joyful influx!" True monstrosities are most of the theological faculties in Germany, precisely because they are composed of liberal and positive theologians. What one builds up, another immediately tears down. And this state of things is praised as worthy of science alone. And so it is, too, when science is understood to mean sophistry, which knows no certain truth at all, and thinks it can prove and disprove everything at the same time. F. B.

In the Centrum's election appeal to vote for Dr. Weißenhagen, after a description of the candidate's immortal merits, it literally says: "You Catholic electors know that one day you will have to give an account of this election to the eternal judge! Therefore, do not shy away from this only slight effort of the ballot!... . Consider that the greater the distance you have to cover to reach the polling station, the greater will be the reward God will give you if you are for God in this election. 'But he that is not for me is against me', this principle is already written in the Holy Scriptures. Whoever wants to stand up and be for God and God's honor at this election, must be for God's anointed, for His representative on earth, for Dr. Weißenhagen, and vote for him." - The "Augsburger Abendzeitung" remarks on this: "Those Catholics who do not blush with shame on reading such words can no longer be helped." (D. A. G.)

That the Jesuit Order was founded from the beginning for the extermination of Protestantism is a generally widespread opinion. On the other hand, recent research has established that Ignatius first founded a small student society for external mission. But already in the year 1538 the mission plan was given up, and with the resettlement to Rome the society became a priests' cooperative for inner mission, a kind of Catholic Salvation Army for the conversion of the dechurched masses. Only in the course of the first decade after its confirmation (1540) the Order developed into the compagnia di papa (as a flying auxiliary corps at the disposal of the Pope) to fight Protestantism. Of course, this statement does not change the present character of the Order. (E. L. K. Z.)

Leo XIII died on the 20th of July. G. V. Pecci was born in 1810 and educated by the Jesuits; he was ordained a priest in 1837, elected bishop of Perugia in 1846, made a cardinal in 1853, and elected pope in 1878. Although Leo XIII has also been hailed by many Protestants as a Christian and tolerant pope, he was neither, but simply the Antichrist, as were his predecessors. He acted as the servant of all Christ's servants, and yet was dominated by a passion to exert his power over

Church and State more and more and to fortify them. He pretended to be the representative of Christ, and yet under this mask he was always intent on only one thing, to displace Christianity with its doctrine of the forgiveness of sins by grace alone for the sake of Christ, and to put paganism with its doctrine of works and its idolatry in its place. Yes, Leo XIII was not a Christian, but a manifest pagan and idolater. As such he lived, and as such he died. In his last ode he takes refuge against death and its terrors not in Christ, but in Mary. It seems as if one reads a passage from Horace or Virgil and hears Aeneas or another Greek or Roman pagan praying, when Leo, for example, in the last stanza of the aforementioned prayer ode of this year, addresses Mary thus: "Detur et ore tuo, caeli regina, beari, Quae dubiae errantem per salebrosa viae Duxeris in patriam; materno munere sospes, Carmine te memori virgo benigna canam." And as for the much-vaunted toleration of Leo XIII, he claimed absolute power for himself even in secular matters, like the popes in the Middle Ages. It is in the nature of the papacy that it strives for world domination and does not renounce worldly power. In 1878 the "liberal" Leo declared that all evils in the world had their cause in apostasy. In 1879 he declared Thomas Aquinas to be the standard Catholic theologian even in the present day. In 1881 he rejected the principle of popular government and in 1888 freedom of religion, speech and teaching. In 1890, as a true rebel, he declared that every Catholic was obliged to obey the ecclesiastical and not the civil power, even in political matters, if the two should come into conflict with each other. - That the secular newspapers nevertheless sing the praises of Leo XIII's liberality, tolerance, and broad-mindedness is only new proof of the well-known ignorance, cowardice, and cheapness of the secular press.

F. B.

On the occasion of the Corpus Christi procession there have been disturbances of the peace, more or less bloody, in many cities of France, in Nantes, Dunkirk, Brest, Lyons, Angers, Ajaccio, even in Paris. The freethinkers and anarchists, incited by demagogues, sought to throw the consecrated host violently into the mud, and took offence at the choirboys carrying lighted candles. The Catholics, of course, used force against force and defended the host against the attackers. - The Corpus Christi procession is, as such, a challenge of the Roman clergy arising from imperiousness. It is therefore quite understandable, although not justifiable, if the French Jacobins do not put up with it. They learned their intolerance from the priests. F. B.

The emptying of the French monasteries is carried out with a quick-wittedness which shows that behind the law there is a determined will which does not shrink from the extreme. And yet it cannot escape the notice of the attentive spectator that a certain restraint is exercised on both sides. Combes did not stop at the "Great Carthusian Monastery," but he did stop at the gracious place of pilgrimage at Lourdes. The clericals, however, do not stoop higher than to passive resistance or to silent warfare on the stock exchange. Thus one avoids on both sides drawing the final conclusions. These are merely preliminary outpost battles, while the real battle has yet to be fought. French ultramontanism is evidently waiting for those "unforeseen events" which are being prepared underhand even with the greatest zeal. But its reticence has another very valid reason. The Roman Church evidently has only a very weak support among the French people. It can

because it no longer unites troops under its banner. This is a realization that is dawning more and more even in ecclesiastical circles. Thus the "Revue du clergé francais" writes: "It is a sad but no longer deniable fact that the French clergy no longer possesses any social influence. It is not only incapable of making the spirit of the customs, laws and institutions which it represents acceptable to the multitude. It is even treated by them with distrust and hostility. The educated man despises, the politician fears the Clerus. The one considers him spiritually insignificant, the other imperious. The great multitude tolerates him, since they cannot do without him at their festivities, the baptism, the confirmation, the wedding and the funeral. But she does not love him. She finds that he is dear to her, and resents the leisure which her own daily indifference affords him. She reproaches him for not possessing all the virtues. And even if she tolerates the priest's official activity, she no longer believes in his divine mission. She does not listen to his words. She allows herself to be blessed by him, but she mocks him."

From Roman monasteries. As proof that their church is the true one, the Romans love to count their monasteries and charitable institutions. That the monasteries, however, are for the most part nothing more than begging and money machines, can easily be seen in every larger city. Some months ago, reports of the cruelty with which the Sisters of the Good Shepherd in Nancy, France, have been sucking their poor victims dry for decades for the sake of filthy lucre, attracted particular attention. Bishop Turinaz of Nancy, who himself pilloried the sisters before the court, declared: no atheistic employer in the whole country would exploit his workers in such a vile manner as was done by the "Good Shepherdesses of Bon Pasteur" at Nancy. Uninterrupted labor and cruel treatment was the lot of the children from the sixth year on. Out of 48,000 orphans in 22 asylums the sisters (7000 in number) are said to have extracted annually not less than $3,000,000. A priest testified that the nuns, in order to keep the true state of affairs secret, had forged and embezzled letters and only allowed relatives to see the children in the presence of the nuns. Marie Lecoanet testified in court that she had worked at the convent for 17 years without pay. Then, when she lost her health and sight, she had been put out on the street by the sisters and left to public charity. The court awarded her $2000.00 damages, and on March 10 the convent was closed. - In Paris several months ago a drawing teacher was arrested for persuading young girls from good families to enter the convent without the knowledge of their parents. The Franciscans assisted her in kidnapping the girls who had been recruited to the convent. - A side piece to the Sisters of Bon Pasteur are the French Salesians, who, in order to gain money for their "leprosarium", founded a bank and gave worthless diplomas as a means of support. That's how these monks scraped together 1½ million francs. - How nuns are persuaded to remain in the convent is reported in the "E. L. B.": "In the New Orleans daily newspapers we read the following news under the date of February 6, 1903, which gives a deep insight: 'Sister Regina Estavon of the "Sacred Heart Convent" here was released from the asylum for the insane yesterday by a judge's decision. The sister had declared a year ago that she wished to leave the order, whereupon she was declared insane and put into that asylum. The sister of the unfortunate woman finally obtained a writ of habeas corpus, by which both the allegedly insane woman and the superior of the convent were put on trial.

Court was cited. Judge Paul immediately satisfied himself that Sister Regina was perfectly sane and immediately dismissed her. She left the courtroom with her sister and will not return to the convent.'"

F. B.

According to Catholic sources, the damages paid by the Catholic mission in China for the losses suffered in 1900 amount to 9,716,507 taels, that is, over 27 million marks. The figures for Manchuria and the provinces of Kwangtung and Kwangsi are missing, so that the total amount of compensation may well be at least 30 million marks. It is clear that this sum far exceeds the material loss actually suffered. Most probably a mass of "atonement money" is included, with which the Roman mission repeatedly had itself paid for the martyr's blood in China. That compensation is claimed and accepted for the material damage really suffered by rebellious mobs, also on the part of the mission, there is absolutely nothing to object to. For Christians, too, have a right to claim the protection of the law. This right is not to be withheld from anyone, not even from the Roman mission. But to seek atonement in money over and above the factual damage actually suffered is bad for a mission. Individual Protestant mission societies, such as the China-Jnland Mission, have renounced any compensation at all. At one of its last meetings, the Basel Mission Board dealt in detail with the question of how it should deal with claims for compensation against the Chinese government, and drew up the following thoroughly sober and evangelical guidelines: 1. The demand for compensation for destroyed mission property is by no means intended merely to hold the mission harmless for the loss it has suffered, but rather to make the people aware that the mission is not defenceless against rape and that the crime cannot go unpunished. 2. In the interest of public order, the protection of our missionaries and the stations, the Committee believes that it cannot abandon the demand for compensation for destroyed mission property, and therefore resolves to hold the demand for compensation as a principle and, as a rule, to act accordingly. 3) The Committee emphasizes that, in assessing compensation, no demands should be made that go beyond the extent of the damage suffered. 4) The committee must leave it up to the brothers and sisters to decide whether they want to claim compensation for private losses. 5. if the mission demands compensation, it is impossible to forbid Christians to do so. 6. catechists and other native employees may, in case of robbery, if they do not receive compensation from the authorities, be granted a moderate sum for the replacement of necessities from the mission treasury. F. B.

The Roman Church of England has lost its Primate, Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster in London. For a little more than ten years the deceased, much hampered by an embarrassing heart complaint, held his high dignity. The short period of his administration, however, was quite sufficient to give to English Romanism a character essentially different from that which it still possessed under his predecessor, the well-known Cardinal Manning. It was more sharply divorced from the Anglican Church, imbued with the spirit of a rugged Ultramontanism, and deprived of all independence from Rome. Cardinal Manning had come from the Anglican Church, and to his end did not disown the finely educated, national-minded Englishman. Cardinal Vaughan represented the antithesis in all respects. He was descended from an old Catholic

Officer's family, which used to supply the hierarchy as well as the monastery with its best forces, had received his last education in Rome, was then employed for several years in the American missionary service, and also, returned to England, directed a missionary institution, the work of which occupied him completely. It was not until 1874 that he ascended the episcopal see of Salford, to exchange it for the archiepiscopal dignity in 1892. From his origin as well as from his later course of development it is explained that he had only little contact with the actual national life according to its spiritual, political and economic side. The social aspirations of his predecessor did not appeal to him. He was a noble prince of the church who basked in the splendor of his dignity, appeared with great pomp, and especially could not tolerate any opposition to his orders. Even with the Jesuits, who did not want to obey his orders, he got into violent quarrels. Likewise with the Irish episcopate, which he suspected of interfering in politics. To the Anglican Church he denied any ecclesiastical recognition. Even Queen Victoria Vaughan tried to treat as heretic at her death by limiting the funeral ceremonies in the Roman churches to the utmost. He developed special activity in the field of mission, school and rescue. He stood up for the Conservative Ministry's teaching proposal with great determination. Thereby he turned to the English Catholicism still shortly before his death a benefit whose far-reaching importance will be revealed only by the coming decades. (D. A. G.)

Of the Stundists in Russia, who must not be confused with the Baptists there and the followers of Tolstoy, the Chief Procurator Pobedonoszeff judges in his last annual report to the Czar that they are religiously and politically the most dangerous sect. He explains why in the following words: "Proceeding from the Protestant principle that man's justification is by faith, whereby it is sufficient to turn in thought directly to Christ, the Stundists negate the church, the holy sacraments, and all the ceremonies of the Orthodox Church, and consider church attendance and the veneration of the Mother of God and all the saints, the cross of the Lord, the images of the saints, and the relics to be a great sin. As to the Lord's Supper, Dr. Dalton writes: "Before me is a transcript of a judicial inquiry against Stundists. To the question, Is the Lord's Supper an actual union with Christ unto eternal life? the unanimous answer was, 'Yes, an actual union with Christ.' Further, what is the use of partaking of the body and blood of Christ? 'It makes us blessed.' Shall the Lord's Supper be administered to all? 'To all who are worthy of it.'" - Commenting on Pobedonoszeff's words, the "Reformation" remarks: "If all this, according to Pobedonoszeff's statement to the Emperor, stamps believers into a sect of the most dangerous kind, then the Church of the Reformation, then the Protestants in Russia, are exposed to the danger of being placed on the same level of condemnation. When, nearly 200 years ago, Metropolitan Jaworski passed a similar sentence against the Protestants, Peter the Great, in vehement displeasure, forbade the publication of the diatribe." In Russia to-day anyone who deviates from the teachings of the State Church is considered a State criminal, and with the recently issued manifesto of "freedom of faith and worship according to a different rite" it is simply bogus. What the right gives, the left takes back. F. B.

Kant and Luther. In the "Christl. Welt" Dr. Sulze writes: "Luther had done great things. He had opened up the source of religion. So he had given his

He had imprinted the certainty that God is our Redeemer. He had given a new and higher content to moral faith and striving - this is by no means known enough. But to establish morality unshakably, his work, the heritage of the Reformation, had not sufficed. The salvation of our nation depended at the beginning of the sixteenth century on the solution of the religious question, at the end of the eighteenth century on the solution of the moral question. It took place at the moment when the complete religious and moral bankruptcy occurred in France. Then it became clear that Luther had opened the floodgates, and that a new awakening of the true life could take place in our country. We have a second reformer, Immanuel Kant. Whoever does not know him does not know Protestantism. Luther and Kant belong together like the wars of liberation and the work of Bismarck. If Luther was the prophet of true religion, Kant was the prophet of true morality. He revealed among us the eternal ground on which all morality rests. He showed that, like nature, the soul of man is governed by an inexorable eternal law which is not transgressed for a moment with impunity. Whoever freely surrenders to it, his inner life unfolds from one glory to another. He is mightier than the whole world, and able to overcome world, sin, and death, and to be blessed even in outward ruin." - Since Kant knows nothing of the Gospel, he knows nothing of true morality. An action is only truly moral and pleasing to God when it not only conforms to the norm of the law, but also springs from the right motive, which is not the pure sense of duty or unconditional obedience to the "categorical imperative," as Kant would have it, but gratitude to God for the grace and forgiveness received in Christ. Kant is the father of modern agnostics and undogmatic ethicists. He babbles about a moral law without a lawgiver and establishes the axiom: What thou shalt, thou canst. Both are nonsense. F. B.

A monument to Servetus by the followers of Calvin. The Calvinist Doumergue has provided the Geneva Historical Society with precise topographical data on the spot in the suburb of Champel in the city of Geneva where 350 years ago the funeral pyre was built on which Michael Servet was burned. It is noteworthy that Calvin's heresy is now being unreservedly exposed by his own followers; for a memorial service is to be held there on 27 October of the coming autumn. We, the reverent and grateful sons of Calvin, our great reformer, condemning an error that was an error of the century, and the faithful followers of freedom of conscience according to the true principles of the Reformation and the Gospel, have erected this monument of atonement on October 27, 1903. On October 27, 1553, Michael Servet of Villanuova in Aragon, born September 29, 1511, died at the stake at Champel." - The reformers cannot consistently erect a monument to religious liberty until they have eradicated from their numerous confessional writings those passages which make it the duty of the State to root out heresy and to spread pure doctrine. F. B.

Karl Bleibtreu writes of **Darwinism** in the Viennese "Gnosis": "The fervor with which our Darwinists search for the missing link of the ape seems immensely gratifying. If it were found, it would prove absolutely nothing. Of course, our good, dear cousin ape, since the five millennia that we have known him, has, with sovereign human likeness, disdained to "evolve," has not submitted to the slightest change.

while we humans, at least, are a snake that bites its own tail, practicing all kinds of outwardly innovative antics and putting on ever-changing garments for the ever-same corpus. And these eternally stable men and apes are supposed to have once performed the miracle of evolving from one another? Even if this process had taken 100,000 years-Darwinists always operate with unprovable numbers-it would have remained the same miracle, and since a ball rolls all the faster the longer it is in motion, both men and apes would then have had to evolve in the last 5,000 years of our era with seven-league boots. Since the latter has now completely failed to happen, the believers in Darwin demand from us a true sacriflzio dell' intelleto, to believe in that once and unique miracle. For in truth they can only refer to this their hypothesis of man's descent from apes for their delusion of evolution, since otherwise geology, fauna and flora teach only transformation. Here there would be nothing relative, but only absolute, a gigantic physical-psychic evolution: Shakespeare as the descendant of a stupid beast. But this beast was already so clever in its primitive beginnings that it created weapons and tools, house and fire, out of its own mental power, although even today the cleverest gorilla and chimpanzee stare at these things without understanding, let alone betray even the most fleeting approach to such genius." Bleibtreu is a follower of Buddhism.

Religion and the natural sciences. "The natural sciences do not lead towards God, but away from God. The naturalist does not need the concept of God for his explanation of nature: he can quite well dispense with it. And what is superfluous does not exist." So speak many physicists and evolutionists today. These godless assertions have recently been countered by the most famous physicist in England, Lord Kelvin, now 79 years old, in the "London Spectator." He declares that the natural sciences do not lead away from God, but towards God and the supernatural. Scientific thought postulates the existence of a creative intelligence. The longer, the more modern biologists come to the insight that there is a life principle in the substance, not from the substance. The doctrine of the fortuitous concourse of atoms explains nothing. Lord Kelvin writes: "There is nothing so absurd as to believe that a number of atoms by falling together of their own accord could make a sprig of moss, a microbe, a living animal . . Here scientific thought is compelled to accept the idea of a creative power. Forty years ago I asked Liebig, walking somewhere in the country, if he believed that the grass and the flowers which we saw around us grew by mere chemical forces. He answered, 'No, no more than I could believe that a book of botany describing them could grow by mere chemical forces.' . . . Every action of free will is a miracle to physical and chemical and mathematical science." - Scientific thinking, founded on experience, nowhere leads to accidental or necessary evolutions out of the fog of fire, but always and everywhere finally to the sentence: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth." We are glad when men like Liebig and Kelvin openly confess this. Unfortunately, however, such noble naturalists often identify the theism to which science leads with Christianity, and so they do not attain to the right salutary knowledge of God. The consolation and teachings that science and philosophy give man cannot stand the sting in the great plight of sin and death. Only the gospel of Christ, of which chemistry and physics know nothing, can help. F. B.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 49. September 1903. No. 9.

Leo XIII.

Especially from his 25th anniversary as Pope until his death Leo XIII. has been almost continuously celebrated in Europe and America by Catholics, Protestants and non-believers, by influential persons of the Church and of the State, and by the secular and ecclesiastical press, not only as a zealous Catholic, a respectable man of the world and a venerable old man, but also as a truly pious man, as a sincere Christian, indeed, as a living saint, as a prince of peace in the world, as an incalculable blessing to church, authority and people, as a very special friend of the United States and its free institutions, as a man to whom all nations and religions pay homage, to whom they owe all honor and thanks, who has always been heartily concerned only with God's glory and the temporal and eternal salvation of men. Now if papists glorify the pope, we are not surprised, for deification of the pope is an essential part of the papist religion. But when Protestant kings, princes, state officials, professors, preachers, and editors vie with the papists in their praise of the pope, it is a scandal in Christendom.

It was a severe annoyance that Wilhelm II gave not only to the Protestant Church of Prussia, whose summus episcopus he wanted to be, but to all of Christendom, when he flirted with the rationalists Harnack and Delitzsch, when he issued the slogan of the "further education of religion" in Görlitz, when he publicly denied the inerrancy of Scripture and, among others, placed Hammurabi and his own grandfather, Wilhelm I., as inspired men alongside the prophets of the Old Testament, as inspired men to the prophets of the Old Testament. But he was guilty of the most disgraceful denial when, some months ago, he appeared before the Pope for the third time (in 1888 for the first time and in 1893 for the second time), seized the hands offered to him by Leo, bowed deeply before the Pope, presented his two sons to him, greeted the German bishops assembled in Rome as "the most reverend Verbs", and then went to the Pope.

I can only pray to God that He may preserve His Holiness for a long time to come for the salvation of the whole world. Yes, when Emperor William II. had received news of the Pope's illness on board the "Hohenzollern" on July 5, he said a prayer for the Pope at the ship's service, declaring, "The Pope whom I know, love and revere is in danger. Let us pray for him. The world needs great, good men. May Almighty God grant the Holy Father many more years." And when the Emperor in Norway heard of the Pope's demise, he sent the following telegram to Cardinal Oreglia: "I am sorely touched by the sad news I have just received. I offer to the illustrious College of Cardinals the expression of my sincere condolences on the lamentable loss which the Catholic Church has suffered by the passing away of the Pope. I will always keep a faithful memory of the sublime and venerable man who was my friend and whose extraordinary gifts of heart and mind inspired me anew with admiration when I visited Rome a few weeks ago.'") A Protestant emperor loves, reveres, and admires the pope, praises him as a great, good, exalted man, calls him his friend, prays to God for the prolongation of his pontifical reign, and expects from him salvation for the whole world!

But Emperor William was not alone in his admiration for Leo XIII. Before him already Edward VII had paid a visit to the Pope, as it were as atonement for the antipapist oath he had taken not long before at his coronation. At Leo's 25th jubilee celebration, furthermore, of the ruling Catholic houses only the Prince of the

1) The clerical "Germania" in Berlin writes of the homage which William II offered to the authority of the Pope during his visit to Rome: "On the whole: The day was great in every respect! The liberals criticize the visit of a sovereign to the Holy Father and want to impose their views on him. With the German Emperor they are silent, and rightly so. They know from two experiences that William II himself knows what he must do and what he must not do, and His Majesty has again shown this to the world. Therefore, the day was once again a great day of honor for the Papacy, for the Emperor and for our entire fatherland! The Emperor grasped both hands offered to him and bent low on them so that his forehead touched them." - How the Catholics intend to exploit this recognition of the Pope is shown by the same "Germania" which recently demanded of the Emperor that he object to the planned Luther Church in Rome. It writes: "We cannot believe that after the cordial meeting between the Emperor and the Pope the German Emperor gave his consent to a demonstration against the Pope and the Catholic Church. For this is obvious, that the new church is to become a church of agitation of the Protestant League against Pabstism and Catholicism." In the "E. K. Z." Dr. Wolff says of the homage paid by William II. to the Pabst: "The Emperor has acted according to the words of our Saviour: 'Bless them that curse you.'" Thus do they preach repentance to princes in Germany!

The Protestant ruling houses were represented by the Crown Princess of Sweden, the granddaughter of Emperor Wilhelm I, by Prince Max of Baden, the future heir to the throne, by the widowed Hereditary Grand Duchess of Saxe-Weimar and others. Even President Roosevelt, with whom Gibbons, Jreland, and other Papist prelates have been coming and going since the Philippine question, has forgotten himself so far as to congratulate "His Holiness" on his anniversary and to present him with a personal gift. Yes, he has abused his high position to condole with the Vatican "in the name of the American people," praising the late pope as a "sublime character" who has "challenged the respect of all Christendom." 1)

The same praise that Protestant princes and rulers have bestowed on the pope has also been sounded ad nauseam by the secular press in Protestant Europe and America from day to day, from week to week. In immoderate phrases it has celebrated the Pope as one of the noblest characters and greatest benefactors and people-pleasers that the world has seen for centuries. The official government newspaper, the "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung," sang the following praises on the eve of the Pope's anniversary: "Tomorrow 25 years will have passed since Leo XIII ascended the papal throne to fulfill his high mission as head of the Catholic Church. Very few Popes have been granted such a Jubilee, and Catholic Christianity throughout the world rightly celebrates tomorrow as a feast day. At the age of ninety-three, Leo XIII, blessed with an astonishing freshness of mind and body, continues to exercise his office with a never-tiring sense of duty as a shining example for all mankind. His services to the Catholic Church are so great and manifold that they fully justify the extraordinary veneration and love shown him by the members of the Church. But Leo XIII has also received recognition and admiration for his work outside the Church. The most beautiful epithet adorning him is the designation of a Prince of Peace. It has received its content not only through Leo XIII's untiring care for the upliftment of the working class, but also

1) When President Roosevelt came to St. Louis for the inauguration of the World's Fair, his first visit was to the seminary, where he attended the rigorosum examination of a priest. He was received with the words: one had expected, however, that the President of the country would first pay his visit to the Catholics in St. Louis. Then the question was put to him in Latin by the Examinandus: whether he wished to present any objection to the truth of the Catholic religion? which Roosevelt, after the question had been translated to him, replied in the negative. - Thus the Romanists set traps, and the Protestants allow themselves to be caught.

by the statesmanlike wisdom with which he repeatedly exercised the office of arbitrator and mediator between secular powers. Germany has always found in Leo XIII a benevolent friend and a sincere admirer." The Detroit Tribune wrote: "For the first time the whole world is watching at the bedside of a dying pope." The New York Evening Post Dost said of the daily reports on Leo XIII: "Long habit had not diminished the lively theilment which all nations, classes, and creeds held for him." The New York Tribune: "The death of Leo XIII deprives the world of one of its most honored personages. His greatness, both in the Church and in the world, cannot be doubted for a moment. He sought the blessings of a peacemaker. He was one of the most democratic of Popes. Under his leadership the Church has steadily approached liberal politics. He was not merely the chief priest of a great Church, but one of the chief citizens of the world." - The secular press praised the excellent qualities and the high mission of Leo XIII: Leo fully justified the veneration offered him by Catholics and Protestants; Leo was a friend of the people, especially of the workers; in his virtues he was a model for all mankind; in Church and State he was a peacemaker; Leo was a friend of Germany and a very special friend of democratic, free America.

To the praises of princes and politicians and of the secular press must be added the flattery which Protestant preachers and newspapers called out to Leo XIII. Several Episcopal preachers were reported to have made public intercession for the Pope in their churches. Methodists and others from their pulpits have called the Pope their "Christian confrere" and praised his "great services to Christianity". In New York, a Methodist in his pulpit praised Leo XIII as "spiritual commander-in-chief and leader of the great army of the Lord's hosts." Of ecclesiastical Protestant papers, the Independent has probably gone farthest in the Pabst's adulation. Priests and other Catholics, who fisted the colours, he has allowed to have their say. The number of July 23, for example, extols of Leo: "He was alive to the general interests of humanity; ever ready to raise his voice for the good cause, in sympathy with every progressive movement of the age, welcoming knowledge in every shape, and furthering it as few in this century have done." "Leo, the man of broad mind and broader charity, departed, leaving a legacy of peace and good will toward all men." "The race of such great and good men should never disappear from among us." And in the same number the editor himself, Dr. Ward, a Congregationalist, topped it all off by writing: "His death will be felt by Protestants more than Catholics can imagine.

It will not be hard to think of Mohammedans and Buddhists holding a funeral service in his honor. If he has ever wounded his enemies needlessly, we have no recollection of the fact; if he has ever failed to take advantage of an opportunity to make any one happier, it has never been recorded." "Republicans will not forget that he read the age and comprehended that despotic government had gone forever." "But better yet, he understood the separation of church and state. He wrote wisely to his bishops that they should always sustain legitimate government." "It transforms a churchling into a Christian to come into contact with the Pope." "Every picture of the Pope bore a gentle smile. Leo looked his cheerful kindness for all the world. It was the peace of faith in the age." "Leo was especially designed to promote universal religious peace." "He has brought to the front everywhere thoughts of love, and the spirit of placability." "His was a life of proven fidelity to God and to humanity." "He won his way into the hearts of Protestants and freethinkers as well as Catholics." Thus the Independent sees in the Pope vain virtues, and for Leo XIII he has only

Praise, not blame. But even many of the ecclesiastical papers, which do not consider the pope to be the antichrist, but see in him a bitter opponent of Protestantism, criticized this and that about Leo, but in such a way that they at the same time expressed their great respect for his piety and Christianity. Thus "The Reformation" writes: "Leo, the weary old man, goes to eternal rest after a long, laborious pilgrimage, but the Roman Church remains." In the same number of the same paper Or. Seeberg, of Berlin, seeks to show that, after all, the pope still fei differently in the faith of Christum. The Lutheran Observer, in its polemic against the Pope, asserts that it does not blame Leo because it does not appreciate the personal character and efficiency of the latter. The Lutheran World

finally writes from tt. August: "His life enabled even those who condemn his ecclesiastical pretensions to respect the deceased Pope as a man and as a Christian."

If we now ask where this glorification of the pope on the part of Protestant princes, politicians, theologians, and editors has its reason, we point to three causes in particular: 1. gross ignorance of historical facts, 2. personal or political interest, and 3. the inability of natural reason to judge the pope correctly, because it does not know Christ. Thus, for example, it is evident that Or. Ward, of the Independent, who takes his mouth so full of the encyclicals of Leo

has either read nothing or understood nothing. To this ignorance of facts is added, in the case of politicians and princes, personal or political interest. "They have an ax to grind." Roosevelt

and other American politicians may have had in mind the weight of the Catholic vote in the coming elections. Emperor Wilhelm believes he needs the Centre against the Social Democrats, who already have more than three million votes. It may be that the Emperor now celebrates the Pope as his "friend," as he did the Sultan some years ago. At any rate, this would be in perfect harmony with the principles of his Minister Bülow, who declared about a year ago: "From the standpoint of pure moral philosophy I cannot conduct foreign policy." In other words: In politics one must ask not: What is right? but: What is expedient? Or: In politics one must lower oneself to the immoral standpoint of the Jesuit general (whom Bülow visited in Rome while Wilhelm II was staying with the Pope). At any rate, it is the fear of socialism that drove the Emperor into the arms of the Pope. But what appalling blindness! William II wants to cast out the devil by Beelzebub. To escape the claws of Behemoth, he leaps into his teeth: and through the terrible annoyance of his friendship with the pope, he at the same time increases the army of the dreaded socialists. Yes, that immoral policy which makes even religion subservient to its interests and purposes has played a great part in the homage paid to Leo XIII. The main cause, however, is and remains that natural reason in general is not able to judge the pope correctly, because it does not know Christ. To whom the real is foreign, he also has no judgment about his counterfeit. He who does not know Christ cannot recognize the Antichrist. To whom the divine mystery of the gospel of Christ is a hidden greatness, he also cannot see through the mystery of wickedness. And the right knowledge of Christ is lacking not only in the papist and secular press, but also in most Protestants today. Men like Ward, of the Independent, and Abbott, of the Outlook, who, in almost all the pro

The Protestants, who have many comrades in the Testant communities, are in perfect agreement with the papal religion in the main. They, like Leo XIII, teach beatitude from works. "Every man," writes Abbott, "may be blessed by his life or his character." To such Protestants, however, Pabstry has more attraction than repulsion. They feel that in the Pope and his religion they are at bottom boasting only of themselves and their own religion. But whoever places Leo XIII in the light of Holy Scripture arrives at quite different predicates than papists and degenerate Protestants have attached to him.

According to Scripture, Leo XIII was an idolater. Leo had made it a fine special duty to elevate the service of the Madonna. He constantly urged the celibate priests, bishops, and monks to make the Queen of Heaven the center of Catholic worship. And he himself led everyone in the cult of Mary. Like the ancient Greeks and

Pomer to their goddesses, Leo XIII prayed to Mary. The "holy Virgin" was his first and last thought. He wore her image constantly on his breast as a powerful amulet and charm. On his deathbed he cried out to Mary to save him from the misery of sin and death. From her hand he hoped to attain bliss. She was to lead him from a foreign land to his fatherland. And he wanted to thank her for it in eternity. One of his last odes, "Extrema Leonis Vota," he thus concludes, "Detur et ore tuo, caeli regina, beari, Quae dubiae errantem per salebrosa viae Duxeris in patriam; materno munere sospes, Carmine te memori virgo benigna canam." Yes, Mary was celebrated by Leo as the "Coredemptrix." And still in the last weeks of his life he was occupied with the plan of organizing a pompous idolatrous festival in Rome on December 8 for the fiftieth anniversary of the Immaculate Conception, for the elevation of the service of the Madonna. He had already appointed four Cardinals to set this celebration in motion and to make it as glamorous as possible. "The service of the Blessed Virgin" - thus Leo justified the intended celebration - "is one of the most powerful means of protection which Providence has bestowed on the Catholic Church. To all lines and in all hardships and persecutions, the Church has taken refuge in Mary and found constant consolation and protection in her." In other respects, too, the pope flaunted his idolatry to the last. From Naples, for example, he had the mitre of St. Januarius fetched and brought to his bedside, as well as the shawl of the Mother of God of Mount Carmel, that they might bring him help and salvation. At the same time Leo XIII nourished and promoted idolatry with his own person. It did him good to hear how he was venerated and idolized in all countries. 1) And the jubilees, which he heaped up, he knew how to exploit skilfully for the glorification of his own person. Years ago the Archbishop of Cremona wrote of Leo XIII: "The Pope has never reached the heights on which he now stands; kings and peoples bow before him. His moral power and profound reverence of the faithful elevate him above all earthly authority. He stands there, as if enveloped by light, like an ethereal heavenly figure. The throne of this moral Pabst's rule (tyranny of conscience! F. B.) stands and will stand till the end of the world, because it is he whom Christ

1) In the *Independent of* July 23, the Margravine of Wentworth, whose painting by Leo XIII was exhibited in Paris in 1900, of her audience with the pope thus: "The Pope welcomed me with these words that went right to my artist's heart: 'How well done! Everybody else has painted me as an old man. But you have put youth into my aged frame.' 'We artists paint as we feel,' I answered. 'Tell me what I can do for you, and speak to me about America,' he continued. 'American Protestants admire you,' I said, among other things, 'and American Catholics adore you.' Patting me on the cheeks, he answered, 'My child, you always speak with esprit.'"

hath himself set up with promise, Super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam." But what do the Scriptures say? "I the LORD, that is my name; and will give my glory to no other, nor my honor to idols," Isa. 42:8. "Thou shalt worship God thy LORD, and him only shalt thou serve," Matt. 4:10. "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and holdeth flesh for his arm, and shuneth the Lord with his heart," Jer. 17:5. - Therefore, let papists and reprobate Protestants celebrate in the pope the pious successor of Peter and right servant of God, - the Scripture cries out to Leo XIII: You are a successor of the pagan Roman pontifices: an idolater and an idol priest!

Leo XIII was a pagan. According to the Holy Scriptures, only he is a Christian who does not want to be justified and saved before God through his own works and penances, but only through faith in Christ. He who wants to go to heaven by human works and merits is a pagan and not a Christian. The Scripture says: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God," Eph. 2:8. "For they that work the works of the law are under the curse," Gal. 3:10. To which class of people did Leo XIII belong, to the heathen who want to be saved by works and are under the curse, or to the Christians who have obtained forgiveness by faith? Leo XIII was for 25 years the head of the church which cursed the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins by grace alone through faith in Christ. Leo professed the sentence of the Tridentine: "Si quis dixerit, fidem justificantem nihil aliud esse quam fiduciam divinae misericordiae, peccata remittentis propter Christum; vel eam fiduciam solam esse, qua justificamur, anathema sit." (Sess. VI, Can. 12.) And because Leo XIII. hated this doctrine of the forgiveness of sins by grace alone through faith in Christ, therefore he chided Luther, who brought this doctrine again to light, "the arch-heretic," called the Lutheran Church the "Lutheran rebellion," the Gospel preached in that Church the "plague." "poisoned doctrines" and "unwholesome venom" that "subverts morals and leads nations to ruin," and the missionaries who preach and spread the gospel of the forgiveness of sins by faith alone, Leo called people "who strive to extend the rule of the prince of darkness." The "Reformation" writes: "Had he (Leo XIII.) had already, as Bishop of Perugia, in a pastoral letter prompted by the founding of Waldensian schools in 1863, called Protestantism 'a plague, the most pestilential heresy, a stupid, ranting system born of arrogance and godlessness,' and had then repeated this judgment in countless new turns of phrase, sometimes against Protestant houses of worship, sometimes against Protestant missionaries and schools, sometimes against Luther, the 'heresiarch' and 'renegade,' sometimes against the 'renegade,' and sometimes against the 'renegade.

The same is true for the words of the Reformation as a whole, which always resulted in unjust and spiteful condemnation, and which were repeated until his last testament in 1902. We have always been to him a 'gif', a 'pes', a sect in which 'those evil spirits which have revolted against God revive in all their faithlessness and hypocrisy'" - As a true pagan Leo XIII also proved himself on a fine sickbed. He placed his trust not in Christum, but in Mary, St. Januarius and his cap, in the shoulder garment of the Carmelites, in the indulgences of the Capuchins, in the last Oelung, and in his own works and merits. The Independent of July 23 writes, "His last words before sinking into unconsciousness were, 'I will die content, for I feel that, if I have merited the good will of the Savior, He will have mercy.'" In Leo's eyes, Christ was the stern judge whose favor he had to secure through his own works and the intercessions of Mary and other saints. In his "Nocturna ingemiscentis animae meditatio," nadp ber Unione Cattolica written on Leo's deathbed, the very first lines read, "Fatalis ruit hora, Leo; jam tempus abire est, Pro meritisque viam carpere perpetuam." [1]) In short, Leo XIII, through the works of
of the law. Leo preached the same way to the millions who looked up to him as their infallible teacher. He led the Christians away from Christ, the rock of their salvation, and commanded them that they should serve Mary and obey the pope, and thus acquire their own blessedness. In his Encyklica of March 19, 1902, Leo XIII says: "There is but One Source of Salvation, One Fountain of Peace, that is Christ and His Governor here on earth, the Successor of St. Peter, the Rock on which the Church is built, the Pope." Yes, Leo XIII preached to the world the most atrocious of all doctrines, namely, the doctrine that he who does not submit to the commandments of the pope cannot be saved. Therefore, it is false Protestants who have praised Leo's merits for Christianity, for true Protestants judge according to the Holy Scriptures. But the Scriptures call out to Leo XIII: You have hated, blasphemed, cursed, and persecuted the gospel of salvation by grace alone through faith in Christ; you have wanted to earn salvation by your own works, and have made the salvation of men dependent on the fulfillment of your commandments: Thou art no Christian, but a heathen, and an apostle of heathenism.

Leo was a church tyrant. In the Roman Church, every priest claims that he has the right to teach the Christians under his authority.

1) Dr. Seeberg concludes from the last two lines of this poem: "Christus adest miserans; humili veniamque roganti Erratum, ah fidas, eluet omne tibi," that Leo's last consolation was Christ alone. But he overlooks the first two lines, which show that he expects mercy from Christ only on the basis of his own merits.

and that Christians, if they lose their blessedness, are obliged to obey him in all things. And when the priest is asked who has given him this power, he points to his bishop. To him he and all the other priests and Christians of his diocese are bound to constant and complete obedience. The bishops, in turn, trace their authority back to the pope at Rome, who, by virtue of his key power, commands all Christians throughout the world what they should believe and do. He was the visible head, the infallible teacher, the king and lord of all Christians, and had the power to command them in all things, including secular and political matters, and all Christians in the world were obliged, for the sake of their consciences, to obey his commandments, even if they ran counter to the clear words of Scripture, as, for example, in the case of the prohibition of the cup in Holy Communion. This power, in fact, extends not only to Catholics, but also to all baptized Protestants. In 1873 Pius IX wrote to the German Emperor: "Everyone who has received baptism belongs in some way or other to the pope." Yes, as the nations belong to Christ, so also to the pope, the representative of Christ on earth. To him all men without exception owe obedience. The pope is entitled to world dominion. And for this power over the whole world, in ecclesiastical as well as in political matters, the Popes have always hungered and thirsted. From time immemorial, politics has been practiced in the Vatican under the guise of the Christian religion. Not blessedness, but the domination of the peoples of the world has been discussed there. Leo XIII claimed unlimited power and rule for himself and exercised it for 25 years over more than 200 million followers. Leo, like his predecessors, presented himself as the king and lord of all Christendom. He demanded blind faith for his word and unconditional obedience for his commandments. Whoever would not bow before him, he banished. Every freer movement, such as reform Catholicism in Germany, France and America, which sought to free itself only a little from Jesuitism and the secular tyranny of the Pope, Leo stifled. Protestants have praised Leo as a liberal pope in comparison with Pius IX. But wrongly. "The person has changed, the Pabbacy has remained the same," said Döllinger, when after the death of Pius IX they tried to persuade him to return to the Pabbacy, since, after all, Leo XIII was a "liberal" man. Leo did not relax one iota from the proud claims of Pius IX and his predecessors. In the Encyklica "Immortale Dei" of November 1, 1885, Leo writes of his rule: "To so immense a multitude (of the Church) God Himself has placed persons in authority who should preside over it with power, and of One to whom He entrusts the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, He has willed that he should be of all the prince and the highest and most certain teacher of the truth.

should." And in the letter of December 10, 1890, Leo says: "Jesus, he King of glory, has conferred on St. Peter and his successors not only absolute power in the Church, but primacy over the kingdoms of this world." The Roman Pontiff has the supreme painting in the Church to teach and to govern; the Pontiff, and he alone, has to determine what man must believe, do, and abstain from, in order to be blessed; every Christian is bound to assent without exception to all that the Popes have taught and will teach; every Catholic is bound to submit his will perfectly to the Pontiff in all things, even political: such and similar assertions are those which recur constantly in the official letters of Leo XIII. Even on his death-bed Leo, in the "Meditatio Nocturna," clinked ben „summae claves, immenso pondere munus," and felt himself to be the Pontifex Maximus, „qui in populis excelso praestat honore." But what does the Scripture say? According to Scripture there is only one Lord and King of the Church, Christ in his Word, and apart from him no one has anything to command or forbid the Church. And whoever does so is an adversary of Christ and a tyrant of the church. The Scripture says, "One is your Master, Christ; but ye are all brethren," Matt. 23:8. "Ye know that the rulers of the world have dominion, and the overlords have power. It shall not be so among you: but if any man will be mighty among you, let him be your servant. And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant," Matt. 20:25-27. Therefore, may Protestant princes and kings bow down with the papists before the pope and acknowledge the legitimacy of his power, - Scripture calls out to Leo XIII: Your power is not conferred on you from above; you have raised yourself up as Lord of the Church; your hierarchy is instituted by the devil: you are a tyrant of Christendom.

Leo XIII was an enemy of the State, especially of American liberty. According to sacred Scripture, the State and the Church are two entirely different and distinct kingdoms. The purpose of the State is civil peace and order. The purpose of the Church, on the other hand, is to make men blessed. The means of the state is the sword, violence. But the only means of the church is the word of God. Therefore, the state should not allow itself to interfere with the church, and the church should not allow itself to interfere with the state. The State is sovereign in its own sphere, and everyone, including the pope and the Roman hierarchy, owes it obedience. The church, however, is not to force anyone by force to become a Christian or to help spread Christianity. It is written, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Matt. 22:21 "Then said Jesus unto Peter, Put up thy sword into the sheath. Shall I not drink the cup which my Father hath given me?" John 18:11. "JEsus answered, My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were

from this world, my servants would fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence," John 18:36. All these sentences, however, the Roman Popes, not excluding Leo XIII, overturned in words and deeds. In the "Syllabus" of December 8, 1864, Pius IX condemns the sovereign State independent of the Pope, civil and religious liberty, the separation of Church and State, and all State schools in which the Catholic religion is not taught. According to the "Syllabus," it is the duty of the State to elevate the Papacy to the status of State religion and to treat all non-Papist worship as unlawful. Finally, according to the "Syllabus," the supervision of science, literature, and school education in the state belongs to the Roman hierarchy alone. And it was to this "Syllabus" of Pius IX that Leo XIII, when he was still bishop, professed himself in the Address of the Umbrian Bishops, written by him, on the 25th anniversary of Pius IX, 1871, in the words, "We believe all that you believe; we condemn all that you condemn." In the Independent of July 23, in which Dr. Ward praises the Pope for having recognized the difference between the State and the Church, a Roman prelate writes:The 'Syllabus' of Pius IX. had roused the world to resistance by the abruptness of its form and the ambiguity of many of its positions. Leo XIII. repeated the same doctrines in his encyclicals, but with so much reasonableness and light that they awakened little adverse comment." Yes, so it is, as the priest writes in the Independent. Leo XIII, even in this piece, forgave nothing of the teachings of the Roman Church as presented by Pius IX. This is irrefutably clear from his official pronouncements. In his first Encyklica of April 21, 1878, Leo called for the restoration of the Papal States. In his official title he adopted the addition, "Sovereign of the secular possessions of the Roman Church." In the Encyklica "Libertas" of June 20, 1888, Leo repeatedly declares the doctrine that the affairs of the State and of the Church are to be separated ("civitatis Ecclesiaeque rationes dissociari oportere") to be a pernicious and absurd doctrine. It was rather the duty of the State to profess the Catholic religion. "Cumque igitur" - says Leo - "sit unius religionis necessaria in civitate professio, profiteri eam oportet, quae unice vera est, quaeque non difficulter, praesertim in civitatibus catholicis, agnoscitur." Nor had the State any right to grant or defend general freedom of thought, speech, press, teaching, or religion. Earlier, in the Encyklica "Humanum genus" of April 20, 1884, Leo XIII had already repudiated freedom of conscience and freedom of worship. In the Encyklica "Immortale Dei," Leo professes the anathema of Pius IX on the phrase: "Ecclesia a Statu, Statusque ab Ecclesia sejungendus est." In the same letter it is censured if a state as such, such as the United States, professes no religion, does not

Leo XIII said that the State had the duty to inquire which was the true religion, not to prefer one religion to another and not to favor one religion over another, to grant equal rights to all religions, to leave the choice of religion to each citizen, and to allow each person to follow any religion or none at all. Leo XIII emphasized that it was the duty of the State to establish Catholic worship and, as such, to institute Catholic exercises, to leave the teaching in the public schools to the Catholic Church, and to abide by the sacred laws of the Church in the courts. As the soul governs the body, so the state must be guided by the Church. Only temporarily were Catholics permitted to conform to the customs of a religionless state in the interest of higher purposes. In doing so, however, the Catholic citizen must not forget that it is his sacred duty to work toward making the State Catholic. 1) It is sad but true that Edward VII, William II, President Roosevelt, and especially the American political press have paid homage in Leo XIII to an enemy of the State and of civil liberty, to a man who denies the sovereignty of every State, and who especially urges the Catholic citizens of the United States to put an end to American liberty.

Nor is there anything wrong with Leo's good works. Probably at no time have the words "His Holiness," "Holy Father," etc., been seen so often as in the recent past. Leo had left all men an example in love of God and neighbor. Leo was praised as a pious man and great benefactor of the people. Like no other for centuries, Leo had not only had the spiritual, but also the spiritual and physical well-being of the people in mind. Even many Lutherans believed that they could not deny their recognition of the noble character, the personal piety and the benevolence of the deceased Pope. William II. posed as if the social salvation of the world depended on Leo. Or. Ward stooped to the flattery: "If he ever wounded his enemies needlessly, we do not remember such a fact; 2) if he ever failed to seize an opportunity to make any one happy, nothing has been reported of it." But even these judgments about Leo XIII have their ground in ignorance of Scripture and facts. Who, according to sacred Scripture, is a

1) See the numerous Latin citations in the *Theological Quarterly*, I, No. 2.

2) According to the editor of the *Independent*, Leo himself was perfect in loving his enemies. But we have already heard how Leo XIII treated his opponents, the Protestants, among whom he also counted the Congregationalists. And if the editor of the *Independent* is a husband, but has not had his marriage performed by a priest, Leo XIII has also said to his face, and repeatedly: You do not live in "lawful marriage," in your marriage the "conjugal bond" is missing, you live in "legal concubinage," your wife is not a true wife, and your children are -. Does the editor of the *Independent* consider such things to be flattery?

pious and holy man, a man of truly good works and a true friend of the people? He who in his life is guided by the holy ten commandments, does not seek his own advantage, but has the good of his neighbor in mind, and does all this out of love for God and out of gratitude that God has forgiven him all his sins for Christ's sake in vain. "Whatsoever ye do not by faith is sin," Rom. 14:23. "Whatsoever ye do by word or by works, do all in the name of the Lord JEsu, giving thanks to God and the Father through him," Col. 3:17. "In vain do they serve me, because they teach such doctrines as are nothing but the commandments of men," Matt. 15:9. - Now if, as we have shown, Leo XIII. was an idolater and a heathen, it follows that all his works also, even the apparently best, were an abomination in God's sight. There can be no more question of true piety and holiness in Leo XIII. than in Sultan Abdul Hamid. Truly good works are as impossible to the one as to the other. But all the works which Leo performed as Pontifex Maximus and Mass priest are vain works of Satan against the first table, pure works in which Leo exalted himself against and above God, blasphemed the name of God, and trampled under foot his word. The things, moreover, which papists are wont to praise so highly: celibacy, confession, fasting, mortification, etc., are all human commandments, by which one serves God in vain, yea, as many abominations, because Leo and those who follow him want to earn their blessedness by them. And where there is no Christian faith, there is not only a lack of love for God, but also of sincere love for one's neighbor. The fact that Leo XIII was not accused, as were many of his predecessors, of public fornication, incest, murder, poisoning, bloody persecution, etc., does not make him a living saint and benefactor of the people. Leo did everything in his power to defraud the people with whom he came in contact of all the goods which God intended for them: spiritual, mental, and bodily, Dr. Ward boasts: one could not have come in contact with Leo without becoming a Christian. But pretending to bring the people to heaven, Leo for 25 years deceived them of Christ's merit, and, as much as there is in him, led them to hell. Instead of elevating spiritually and morally the peoples, who for centuries have been under the rule of the pope, Leo has kept his followers in raw ignorance, zealously promoted among them all kinds of idolatry and superstition, and tolerated and favored fornication and immorality, in order that he might the more easily subjugate and imprison them. And as for earthly goods, Leo, with his employees, never tired of fleecing and sucking countries and people dry. Yes, Leo XIII sheared his sheep. As in his time Leo X. plundered Germany through Tetzel, so also Leo XIII. with his masses, consecrations, indulgences, jubilees, etc., practiced fraudulent haggling in all lands. It is not too much to say that Leo and his clerks.

have taken in more money for "false goods" in the last 25 years than all the other frauds in the world put together. And no fakir has ever dared to offer his customers more worthless merchandise than the pope sells every day in indulgences, masses for souls, consecrations, etc., for heavy money. That Leo XIII. and his priests, monks, and nuns dwelt as tyrants, bloodsuckers, oppressors of the people, and corrupters of the people, is testified to loudly by the periodic revolts and complaints of the Catholics in Cuba, the Philippines, Spain, Italy, Austria, and France. Yes, if Leo had not taken root in the consciences of his followers, the Catholic peoples would long ago have shaken off his yoke and the yoke of his priests. "Woe unto you, Christian scholars and Pharisees, hypocrites, who eat the houses of widows, and offer up long prayers; therefore ye shall receive the more condemnation," Matt. 23:14. This word also applies to Leo XIII.

Leo XIII was an enemy of the Bible. Many Protestants have credited Leo XIII with nothing more than the establishment of the "Commission for Biblical Studies". This was a clear symptom that the papacy had inwardly come much closer to the evangelical truth. But even with this fame it is nothing. In fact, in the apostolic letter of October 30, 1902, Leo XIII muzzled the Bible Commission and gagged the Bible itself so that it could say only what was agreeable to the pope. In the apostolic letter it is emphatically emphasized that God alone has entrusted to the pope the sure, true, and lawful interpretation of Scripture; that in interpreting Scripture the appointed commission must therefore adhere to the authentic meaning recognized by the pope; that in its interpretation it must maintain the unity of opinion, the authority of revealed truths (church doctrine), and the authority of tradition; that finally a free discussion is permitted only in such passages about whose meaning the church has not yet decided. - From this it is clear that Leo XIII did not set up the Biblical Commission to let the Holy Scriptures have their say in the Church, but to use them as sheep's clothing for his heresies and as a cloak for his wickedness. Leo did not want to hear the Scriptures in order to learn from them, but to have the Scriptures hear him and be forced to say what the pope teaches. To make the Bible "harmless" in our Bible-rich times, that is the true purpose of the Bible Commission appointed by Leo. Leo XIII, like his predecessors, fully professed the sentence of Tridentine: "Ecclesiae (Papae) est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum Sanctarum." Like Pius IX, Leo held that the ex cathedra decisions of the pope did not require Scripture, that they stood and were valid without Scripture, indeed, against Scripture. Leo was an advocate of the dogma: "Romanum pontificem, cum ex cathedra loquitur, ... infallibilitate pollere ... ideoque ejusmodi Romani pontificis de-

finitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu ecclesiae, irreformabiles esse." In the "Sapientiae Christianae" of January 10, 1890, Leo says: "But which doctrines are revealed by God, it is for the teaching Church (pope) to determine, for it is to her that God has entrusted the preservation and explanation of His Word." "Therefore, to the authority of the pope must also be subjected the judgment as to what divine revelation contains, what agrees with its contents, and what contradicts it." In other words, Scripture teaches what I, Leo XIII, say. But he who stands thus by Scripture is an enemy of the Bible, and can pursue with a Bible commission only the purpose of shutting the Bible's mouth. That Leo XIII was an enemy of the Bible, and especially of its distribution, is already evident from the fact that papists still do not have or read Bibles in their homes. In the last 25 years millions and millions of Bibles have been brought to the people by Protestants. But among the Papists today the legends of the saints still take the place of sacred Scripture. And Leo XIII did everything in his power to keep the Bible out of the hands of the Catholics. Whoever wants to have or read a Bible must still get permission from his priest. By merely asking for a Bible, the Catholic layman exposes himself, now as in the past, to the suspicion of heresy. And whoever acquires a Bible against the will of the priest is often still burned today. Only a few months ago, under the direction of the priest Rongier, the Sisters of Mercy publicly and solemnly burned more than 280 Bibles which they had taken from the natives in the Fiji Islands, and this was defended by the Romanists, also in America. They knew that the Roman enemies of the Bible in Fiji had acted entirely in the mind and spirit of Leo, who, with Pius IX, called the Bible societies a "pernicious pestilence" and placed the Bible itself on the Index. Christ says, "Search the Scriptures!" Leo XIII, however, hated the Bible, gagged it, and drove it out of the homes of Christians: Leo was an enemy of the Bible.

Leo XIII was a heretic. According to the Holy Scriptures, only he who teaches the Word of God is a teacher of the Church, pure and sincere. "If any man speak as the word of God," 1 Pet. 4:11; but he that departeth from the holy scriptures, or addeth thereto, or subtracteth therefrom, and teacheth men so, is a false teacher in the church, a false prophet, and a heretic, from whom Christians ought to flee. "Beware of false prophets," Match. 7:15. "If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not at home, neither salute him," 2 John 10. "Avoid a heretical man, if he be admonished once and again," Tit. 3:10. "But if we also, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed," Gal. 1:8. What was Leo XIII?

a teacher of the church or a false teacher and heretic? He himself claimed to be not only a teacher of the Church in general, but the one great teacher whom not only some but all men without exception must hear if they are to lose their blessedness, yes, the infallible teacher whose words ex sese are certain and incorrigible, whom all Christians must follow blindly, without examining and inquiring for themselves, and without any contradiction, and at the same time the judge to whom it belongs to brand and banish as a heretic anyone who will not bow to his words and commandments. Leo XIII professed the dogma of infallibility. And as doctor infallibilis unb irreformabilis Leo also gerirt himself in his official -decrees. Leo writes: According to divine right, it is for the pope "to prescribe" "what we are to believe and do." "But the supreme teacher in the church is the Roman Pontiff." It belongs to him alone to "preserve and transmit the doctrine, and to judge of it in the highest truth." But how does the teaching of Leo and the Catholic Church agree with Scripture? - Scripture says: The Bible alone is the infallible norm of our faith and life. Leo XIII: Not the Bible, but the pope. The Scripture commands: "Thou shalt worship God alone. Leo: Not God alone, but also Mary and the saints. The scripture saith, Man shall be saved through faith alone in Christ. Leo: Not by faith alone, but also by works, and let him who denies this be accursed! The Scripture teaches: Christ is the only Lord and Master of His Church. Leo XIII says: As Bishop of the Roman Church, I am the Lord and Master of all Christendom, and let him who does not acknowledge me be accursed! Christ says of the chalice in Holy Communion, "Drink ye all of it." The pope: Only the administrating priest, none of you laymen. The Scripture teaches that Mary was conceived and born in sin. The Father: Not so, Mary was conceived immaculate, and whoever thinks otherwise in his heart, let him be accursed! Scripture teaches: the natural man can contribute nothing to his conversion. The pope: the natural man can earn the grace of conversion. The Scripture says: Christ has done enough for all sins. The Father: Not for all, for man himself must atone for real sins and temporal punishments, here or in purgatory. Scripture teaches that God forgives sins for Christ's sake alone. Leo XIII: Not only for the sake of Christ, but also for the sake of the merits and intercessions of the saints. Scripture teaches: the Christian can and should be certain of the forgiveness of his sins. The pope: certainty of forgiveness is sinful presumption, and doubt of forgiveness is a godly virtue. Scripture says: No one can keep the law of God perfectly. The pope: Yet this is possible for monks and nuns. Scripture teaches that the church is made up of all who believe in Christ. Leo: The church is the pope with all who join him. The Scripture says: The church is

originally bestowed the keys. Leo: Not to the church, but to the bishop of Rome alone. Scripture teaches: In the Church only Christ and no man has anything to command. Leo: The church commandments of the pope and his staff are as binding as God's commandments. Where Scripture says, "Yes," the pope cries, "No." And where Christ says, "No," Leo shouts, "Yes." Therefore, let Papists alike adore Leo XIII as the infallible teacher of Christendom, and Protestants admire the wisdom of the Pope, - Scripture cries out to Leo XIII: You are a false teacher, a manifold and obstinate heretic, a wolf in sheep's clothing, from whom all Christians must flee.

Leo XIII was the Antichrist. In the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, an exact picture is drawn of the most dangerous enemy of the Church, from whom Christians should be doublyware. This enemy of Christ and his church would not destroy the church from without, but from within; in the temple of God, in the midst of Christianity, he would sit and have his being; he would seduce the church to great apostasy from Christ; in the church he would appear as a tyrant; he would exalt himself above all that is called God and worship; yes, as God he would allow himself to be worshipped in the church; he will unfold a mysterious power of wickedness and an incomprehensible, supernatural magic of seduction; as a means of seduction he will use all kinds of lying powers and signs and wonders; he will surround himself with the appearance of special holiness and piety; he will spread powerful errors and lies in the church; he will command what God has forbidden, and forbid what God has released or commanded, etc. This enemy of the church the Scripture calls the "wicked" and "vile," the "man of sin and the child of perdition," the "antichrist," whom God will kill with the spirit of his mouth, and whom he will put an end to by the appearing of his future. - Now if we go through the church and its history with this drawing which God Himself has given us of the Antichrist, we must confess: The great Antichrist whom the Bible draws is not a Roman Emperor who bloodily persecutes Christians, not Muhammad and his successors who have shed much Christian blood, nor Napoleon, nor any great Socialist or Nihilist yet to come, but solely the Pope at Rome. In Leo XIII, his predecessors, and his successors, we find again, and strongly marked, every single feature which the sacred writers have given to the image of Antichrist. And if, on the other hand, one points to the facts that millions of Catholics revered Leo XIII as the head and king of the Church; that Leo was almost universally reputed to be especially holy, pious, and wise; that the secular and ecclesiastical press celebrated the Pope as the powerful prince of the Church, the pillar of the State, and the benefactor of the people;

that Edward VII, William II. and other Protestant princes, politicians, theologians and laymen have bowed before Leo XIII. that Edward VII, William II, and other Protestant princes, politicians, theologians, and laymen have bowed before Leo XIII, acknowledged his authority, and admired his great "piety"; that the Presbyterians have erased from their confession the words in which the Pope is called the great Antichrist; that the number of Protestants who see in the Papacy a beneficial power and especially a bulwark against unbelief and anarchy is growing ever larger; that, finally, even among the present Lutherans, the number of those who consider the Pope the great Antichrist is small: all this, and much else that is brought forward in favor of the papacy, does not mislead us in our judgment of Leo XIII. All this does not contradict the picture which Scripture draws of the great Antichrist; on the contrary, it is a clear feature of this very picture, and agrees most exactly with what Scripture has prophesied of the mystery of wickedness and its seductive power. He who judges the pope not by the multitude of his followers, not by the lies he spreads about himself, not by outward appearances, and not by natural reason, which does not know Christ and therefore is not able to distinguish between him and Antichrist, but by the holy Scriptures, must call out to the much-celebrated Leo XIII: You are an idolater, a heathen, a church tyrant, an enemy of the state, an oppressor of the people, an enemy of the Bible, a heretic, yes, the great Antichrist himself.

May God ward off the seduction of the Antichrist, control the great upsets, grant repentance to those who have heard and been deceived, and put an early end to the Pabstacy through the appearance of his future.

F. B.

Theological Dicta Classica.

(Found in Luther's works.)

De Scriptura Sacra.

Preliminary remark. "Let every man therefore see that he be a simple student of the Scriptures: for wise men enter not into them, but the Scriptures remain closed unto them." (Luther.)

"God's word is a delicious, precious gift, which God holds in high esteem, and esteems that he regards even heaven and earth, sun, moon, stars, as nothing against this word." (V, 577, § 198.)

"This some exalts holy Christendom and the Church, that the holy Scriptures are understood; this some oppresses Christendom and the Church, that the holy Scriptures are not understood." (XXI, 7. Anno 1519.)

"Thus Luther himself does not want to be Lutheran, except in so far as he teaches the holy Scriptures purely." (XXI, 234. Anno 1528.)

1. "I must have God's word, I will hear what God says." (XI, 882, § 9. Anno 1522.)

Nota. "To the Scriptures we should adhere, and not follow our own conceits, nor any man's doctrine; for God will not have given his Scriptures in vain; there he will be found, and nowhere else." (XI, 202. Anno 1522.)

We find an exceedingly fine saying in Luther's explanation of his "dear Genesis": "I am hostile to my books, and often wish that they would perish, therefore that I worry that they would tease, hinder, and keep the reader from reading the Scriptures themselves, which alone are the fountain and source of all wisdom." (I, 1938. His Enarrat, in I Libr. Moses, Luther began on June 3, 1536, but were not completed until 1544 or 1545).

"I will keep the word of God, and be satisfied with it; with it I will die, with it I will live." (II, 1145. Enarrat, in Libr. Moses.)

"Here I stand, here I defy, here I proudly say, God's word is above all things to me, divine majesty stands with me; therefore I give not a hair's breadth if a thousand Augustinians, a thousand Heinzen churches besides, were against me, and am sure that the right church holds with me to God's word, and leaves Heinzen churches clinging to men's words." (XIX, 272, §102. St. L. ed.)

2. "And the same word let God speak unto thee by men. - St. Peter and St. Paul speak not their words, but God's word." (XI, 822, § 10. Anno 1522.)

Nota. From the year 1517 to 1546, one tone rings through quite clearly in Luther's writings: God is author primarius Scripturae sacrae, men are the organa who serve him in their way. Our old Lutheran dogmatists have rolled up their building blocks from Luther's works. Hear Johann Gerhard: "Scripserunt non ut homines, sed ut Dei homines, h. e., ut Dei servi et peculiaria Scripturae sacrae organa." (I, 19, § 18. Loc. de Scr. sac.) Or hear Hollaz in his Examen theol. ac roam. : „Causa efficiens principalis est Deus; causa instrumentalis Scripturae sacrae sunt prophetae sub veteri et apostoli sub novo testamento."

"In the sacred Scriptures God speaks." (Ill, 2269, § 46.)

"It is the word of God Most High." (IX, 1405.)

"What unspeakable grace it is that God speaks to us through his word." (Ibid.)

The author of Scripture is the Holy Spirit.

(Dicta 3-9.)

3. "The holy Scriptures are spoken by the Holy Ghost." (111,2798. Anno 1543.)

Nota. "In Scriptura sacra Spiritus Sanctus in oratione sua factus homo est. Ergo: Prophetae et apostoli auditores et non autores

codicis sacri sunt." In how many passages, therefore, does Luther virtually say, "The Holy Spirit speaks." It is truly clear speech that Luther does. He teaches that in inspiration God himself takes the floor. And he speaks according to the power of comprehension of man through man to man. "For we know that God Himself speaks to us in the Scriptures," Luther says. (IX, 1448. Anno 1541.)

4. "The holy Scriptures are the book of the Holy Ghost." (IX, 1365.)

5. "The Bible is the Holy Spirit's book." (IX, 1383.)

Nota. "It is Scripture; Scripture of the Holy Ghost which we act," says Luther in the preface to the Enarrat, in Libr. Moses. "The third person is the Holy Spirit, who utters such saying and the whole Psalm through David." (IX, 1355.)

6. "The Holy Ghost putteth the **word** into the mouth of the prophets." (III, 1172. Anno 1524.)

Nota. Luther teaches not only the impulsus ad scribendum, but also the suggestio rerum et verborum. So he teaches the verbal inspiration. The Lutheran systematists then expressed themselves thus: "Omnia et singula verba, quae in codice sacro leguntur, a Spiritu Sancto prophetis et apostolis inspirata sunt." (Hollaz, Proleg. III, q. 17, p. m. 95.) "This is the Holy Spirit's voice and word, so done through the prophets." (V, 142, § 75.)

7. "One gives to the Holy Spirit **all the** sacred Scriptures." (111,2797. Anno 1543.)

Nota. "One sings in the article of faith (in the Nicäum) of the Holy Spirit thus, Qui locutus est per prophetas." (l. c.)

A . Old Testament.

a. "The Holy Spirit is the Master of this book (Genesis)." (II, 828, § 94.)

b. "That the Holy Spirit Himself, and God, the Creator of all things, was the right Master of this book (Genesis)." (II, 682, 8 30.)

c. "The Holy Spirit scattered and sowed the seed of divine wisdom through Moses." (V, 1081, 8 1st Exposit. d. 90th Ps. Anno 1534.)

d. "But once the Holy Spirit here (Ps. 45) secretly beholdeth Moses." (V, 490, 8 38.)

e. "Now this I say, that I may provoke you, and give you cause, to move and consider these words of the Holy Ghost (Ps. 45) rightly and well, which he thus speaketh unto us for comfort, that we may learn to esteem them highly, and spread them abroad." (V, 598, 8 228.)

f. "That God had spoken these things by David (Ps. 95)." (V, 1086.)

g. "That, on the other hand, the promise of the Holy Spirit in the 37th Psalm, v. 25. must also be fulfilled." (II, 863.)

h. "Because the Holy Spirit calls us all to sing (Ps. 98)." (IX, 1370.) "So hath the Holy Ghost chosen this likeness (Ps. 129, 6.)." (IV, 2794, § 47.)

i. "Although the Holy Spirit could scarcely have spoken more contemptuously of it (Ps. 129:6.)." (IV, 2798, § 55.)

j. "Here the Holy Spirit sets one against another (Ps. 129, 6.)." (IV, 2799, 8 56.)

k. "The Holy Ghost answereth (Ps. 1)." (IX, 1493.)

I. "The Holy Spirit alone speaks here (Ps. 1)." (IX, 1494.)

m. "And because it is all here (Ps. 2) the Holy Ghost remembereth." (V, 115, 8 18.)

h. "For thus hath the Holy Ghost said and declared it in this Psalm (Ps. 2) long before." (V, 119, § 26.)

o. "What then hath the Holy Ghost forgotten and passed over in this Psalm (Ps. 2)?" (V, 120, 8 29. Vide § 31. 37.)

p. "The Holy Spirit, in the words (Ps. 109:17.), indicates their abominable, miserable blindness and hardening." (V, 89.)

q. "As the Holy Spirit does here in this (51st) Psalm." (V, 676, 8 2.)

r. "So the Holy Ghost is there that speaketh it by Daniel." (Ill, 2821. Anno 1543.)

s. "This prophet Habakkuk I have taken before me to interpret . . what he has in him, and what the Holy Spirit says and teaches us through him." (VI, 3092, 8 1. Anno 1526.)

t. "David calls the Holy Spirit, to whom he gives all that the prophets prophesy." (Ill, 2797, 8 3.)

u. "The Psalter would like to be called a little Biblia; . . that methinks the Holy Ghost himself would take upon himself the trouble, and bring a short Bible and book of examples .... together." (X IV, 24, 8 4. Anno 1523.)

v. "And methinks the Holy Ghost (Ezek. 38. 39) shortens the Turk's name." (VI, 1408, 8 2. Anno 1530.)

(To be continued.)

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

"**Protestant Obituary in Memory of Pope Leo XII** by A. L. Gräbner.'") From the official decrees of the deceased pope it is shown here that Leo XIII "put the Reformation, according to its doctrine, at the stake as heresy, according to its consequences as a source of horrible abominations, and reviled our marriage, the basis of our entire social life, as concubinage,

1) Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. price: 5 cents.

condemned our most precious rights and liberties as evils contrary to God and reason, and their defense as impermissible, but made it a sacred duty for his followers to fight them in our country as well". This writing was to be distributed en masse. F. B.

Augustana College and Dr. Harper. The *Lutheran of* June 25 reports that Dr. .Harper, of the University of Chicago, delivered a speech at Augustana College to the baccalaureate students on "The Higher Life and Religion." Dr. Harper is one of the higher critics, and can speak nothing but perversities about religion. Does the *Lutheran* approve of this ecclesiastical communion in the Conciliar itself with a
Liberals? F. B.

Dr. Rhodes, of General Synod, took an active part in the Methodist festival in St. Louis, June 28, in celebration of the bicentennial of John Wesley's birth. "It was the only pastor on the program who was not a Methodist." So report with pleasure leaves of the General Synod. (L. K.)

Union of Methodist Episcopalians and United Brethren in Germany. The "Apologist" writes of August 5: "From the Mission Board of our Church in New York comes the news that the 'United Brethren' wish to cede their missionary work in Germany to our Church. Misfion Secretary Wm. M. Bell, of the 'Native, Frontier and Foreign Missionary Society of the United Brethren,' has been instructed by the Mission Board of his Fellowship to submit this offer to our Mission Board on the sole condition that our Mission Board will accept this missionary work of theirs in Germany, as it now exists, and make suitable provision for its maintenance from April 1, 1903. This missionary work comprises eleven congregations and nine church buildings. The number of members is stated to be about 1000. This step was not entirely unexpected. There has always been the most friendly relationship between the United Brethren in Germany and our church there, and the thought of a union with our church was suggested several years ago. Since the union of the Wesleyan Methodists with the Episcopal Church in Germany, this desire has undoubtedly increased considerably in strength among the United Brethren. Our Mission Board has agreed to undertake this mission work, provided, 1st, that the General Mission Committee will approve the step, and make the necessary provision for its maintenance, and, 2nd, that our Conferences in Germany will likewise approve this union."

Nonrecognition of Divorces. The Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that any state has the right to protect the marriage of its citizens from dissolution by another state if the person seeking the divorce has not bona fide settled there. The decision was prompted by the Massachusetts Supreme Court's ruling that a divorce obtained in Dakota was invalid for Massachusetts and later a second one granted in Oklahoma. By a vote of 5 to 3, the United States Supreme Court decided in favor of the Massachusetts Supreme CourtS judgment. Three of the eight justices thought that it was inconsistent with the words of the Constitution: "Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records and judicial proceedings of every other." The other five judges, however, held that these words had no application to persons who reside in a state only for the purpose of obtaining a divorce there, and who have no intention of making that state their permanent home. F. B.

II. Abroad.

For the "Prussian General Synod" in the fall, the "Friends of the Positive Union" under the leadership of Dr. Stoecker have drawn up the following action program: "First, the group of the 'Friends of the Positive Union' is pleased with every measure that is suitable to promote a union of the Protestant German regional churches, including the presently planned establishment of the 'German Protestant Church Committee'. But it misses in this the use of the synodal element and instructs its members to work in the synods and synodal committees for additions in this sense. Secondly, it makes it the duty of its general synods to make the question of the appointment of theological professorships the subject of discussion at the general synod, in the sense that theologians who are in irreconcilable opposition to sound evangelical Christianity cannot be appointed. Third, it expresses its wish that the General Synod demand anew the participation of the General Synodal Board in the filling of all ecclesiastical offices. Fourth, it declares it to be an ecclesiastical necessity to revise the qualification of church electors so that only those members of the congregation who are able to testify that they regularly participate in the divine service and Holy Communion acquire and exercise the right to vote. Fifth, it considers a financial strengthening of the church, especially in the centers of church government and synodal life, to be indispensable if the church is to fulfill its tasks. A strengthened right of taxation of the General Synod is the indicated way to this end. Sixth, it considers it the generally necessary task of the Protestant Church, in personal and congregational life, to bring its offices and organs, in the land of the Reformation, more strongly to bear on the influence of the Church of the Reformation." - The program suffers from vagueness of expression. What, for instance, does it mean, "to bring the influence of the Church of the Reformation more fully to bear"? The liberals will put up with such phrases. F. B.

At a banquet given to the Cardinal-Archbishop Fischer on July 7 in the Bürgergesellschaft at Cologne, the Cardinal made a toast to the Emperor and the Pope; according to the "Köln. Volksztg." the following sentences appeared: "I have heard from the Emperor's own lips how highly he esteems the Holy Father, and the Holy Father told me several times that he honors our Emperor, indeed that he admires him. The pope said to me a few days ago: 'Je vous prie d'exprimer ma sincere vénération et mon sentiment profond de mon amitié envers votre empereur!' How beautiful and uplifting was the unmistakable interaction between the Pope and the Emperor. The meeting of these two sovereigns a few weeks ago was a moment of world history. Even if the Pope and the Emperor are different in many respects, we must nevertheless acknowledge the congeniality in which they cooperate in their creative zeal in all areas of this life. This cooperation of the two greatest rulers of the present time is all the more important because the spirit of negation, destruction and overthrow has become more widespread in our fatherland. It is therefore necessary that all forces that preserve the State unite, and that those who are called to stand at the head, to guide the spirits and to wield the sword, work together for the good of the fatherland, for the protection of justice. It is necessary for both powers to meet, as we have recently seen in the case of

of the meeting between the pope and the emperor." - The purpose of the romen is clear. There's a big hook in the big bait. At any rate, Wilhelm II also notices this intention, but as it seems, he is neither religiously nor politically disgruntled by it. F. B.

A "Catholic House Bible" with episcopal printing permission and recommendation appears in Trier. In the preface to this "Bible", which is actually not a Bible, but a biblical story for the Catholic people, by vr. Ecker, professor at the seminary in Trier, Bishop Korum says: "For years it has been my most ardent wish that our Catholic people should learn more than before about the history of the revelation and the saving deeds of God by reading the Holy Scriptures. There rests on the Word of God a power and an anointing which no historical account, not even the best, can replace. It is therefore with sincere joy that I welcome your intention to give the Christian people a home Bible, which, in the closest connection to the wise regulations of the Church concerning the reading of the holy book, contains the text itself in a literal translation and could be recommended without any hesitation as a family and home book..... May the work find its way into every Christian family. In former times the Holy Scriptures were the book from which parents and children read to each other the great deeds of God. Sadly, in more recent times, that has become quite different. May your home Bible help our Catholic families to return faithfully to the old traditions and give the Bible its former place of honor." rc. On this lie of Bishop Korum's: that the Papist Church had cultivated the reading of the Bible among the people, the "E. K. Z." remarks."In 1486 Archbishop Berthold of Mainz forbade, under penalty of excommunication, the printing of German translations of Biblical books, because their distribution in the vernacular would profane religious matters; also, the German language was incapable of serving as an expression of profound religious truths, and it was impossible for the ignorant and uneducated to understand the Holy Scriptures. In 1550 the Conciliar of Trent decreed that the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the vernacular, even if the translation was done by a Catholic and approved by the ecclesiastical authorities, should only be permitted with written permission, because it was generally more harmful than useful. In 1595, Pope Clement **VIII** imposed a galley punishment for reading. imposed a galley punishment for reading Italian translations of the Bible. In 1817 a papal bull banned the Catholic Bible Society, founded in Regensburg in 1805, which printed and distributed a Catholic translation of the Holy Scriptures. In 1897 Pope Leo XIII also placed the Bible anew on the Index and forbade the translations of the Holy Scriptures into the vernacular languages just as he forbade the lewd writings^.", F. B.

Pius X. This is the name that Giuseppi Sarto, the newly elected Pope, has given himself. "I announce to you great joy" were the words with which Cardinal Macchi informed the people of this election. Immediately the idolatry began. The bells were rung, and in triumph Pius X was carried to his cell, preceded by the cross. At every second and third step a halt was made to have his ring kissed and to bestow his blessing. At the coronation ceremony the Cardinals offered their "Adoration." Individually they approached the throne of the Pontiff and kissed Pius X's hand, knee, and foot. Pius X's hand, knee and foot. In the same manner the Marshal of the Conclave and many other ecclesiastical and secular dignitaries paid homage to him. On the sockia p^tatoria Pius was carried in procession through the church, and to the people he imparted his

Blessing. The people shouted, "Hurrah for the Pope-King!" Cardinal Macchi placed the triple crown on his head with the words: "Take the tiara, adorned with three crowns. Remember, you are the father of princes and kings, the ruler of the world, on earth the Vicar of our Savior Jesus Christ, who is the honor and glory of all creatures." No sooner was Pius X elected than the Papist, secular, and in many cases the Protestant press again began to sing the praises of the new idol in Rome. As Patriarch of Venice he had practiced vain works of love and mercy, had especially taken care of the poor, yes, he had even destroyed some doubtful relics there; at the coronation ceremony he had disregarded many ancient customs: instead of being carried, he had, for example, gone on foot into the Sistine Chapel and thus shown himself to be a truly modern man; Pius X. had obviously been a democratic Pope. was obviously a democratic pope, a man of the people, who had sympathy for the workers, and he would give the Roman Church a democratic character; Pius was a man of great piety, goodness of heart, and erudition; he would not seek his glory in politics, but in the elevation of the Church and of religious life; Pius had a desire not for political, but for religious activity, and would direct the work of the Church into purely ecclesiastical channels; he would initiate a reconciliation between the Vatican and the Italian government and would not attach any particular importance to the restoration of his temporal power; the longer the Catholic Church under him would become more and more a church among the churches and would lose the character of a state within the state; even if he would not succeed in bringing the Protestants back into the Catholic Church, he would nevertheless considerably reduce their aversion to the Pabstacy; now it was no longer the doctrines that were emphasized, but the pious life, and Pius X. was also interested in this; in general, the Pabstacy would no longer be regarded as a state within the state. In general, the Pope would be recognized as the leader and champion of Christianity against materialism and socialism and other "phases of the Antichrist"; Germany and America in particular could wish themselves luck with the new Pope, they would be especially favoured by Pius X. The favors he has already shown Cardinal Gibbons and American pilgrims testify to his preference for free America; Pius considers the Americans to be the "blossoming youth of Catholicism" and it is with special joy that he has conferred his apostolic blessing on the United States; since he is not bound by the promise Cardinal Gibbons made to Leo XIII. Since he was not bound by the promise made by Cardinal Gibbons to Leo XIII, Pius would provide the United States with at least two new Cardinals; it was not known what the policy of Pius X would be, but all the signs were favorable and indicated that he would continue the good work of Leo XIII. Rome would remain under Pius the "central brain of a world-wide moral power"; and as the sympathy which Protestants showed Leo XIII was touching for Catholics, so also the interest which the same Protestants took in the election and person of Pius X was a hopeful sign of the times. - Thus one knows how to praise this and another that about Pius X, and yet it is all gossip and wretched priest-inspired chatter. If anything in the world is certain, it is this, that Pius X. will not let up one iota from the papal pretensions. Of Pius and the Papists the word from the fable is true: "In principatu commutando saepius Nil praeter domini nomen mutant pauperes." F. B.

Indulgence fraud in Spain. J. McCabe writes in *The Contemporary Review:* Few in England know that the Roman Church in Spain continued in the twentieth century the shameful trade in indulgences. I have before me two of these precious documents (bulas). From a friend they were obtained in Madrid

Bought in the year of salvation 1901 and they bear that date. An eye-catching advertisement in the window of an ordinary bookstore announced that bulas were available here, and my friend went in and asked for some. He is evidently not a Spaniard, probably a heretic; but no questions were asked. For the sum of 75 centimos (this sum was clearly written at the top of the bula) he was handed a document with many seals and in great style, which promised him full indulgence under the usual conditions. Another 75 centimos bought a letter of indulgence which gave him permission to eat meat on fast days. Both documents speak grandly of the Crusades in which Spain had so gloriously participated and for which the Holy Father had rewarded her with these spiritual privileges. On the indulgence note (which, to be sure, 80 to 90 out of a hundred in Spain cannot read) it is written that the purchase money, which is called limosna, alms, on the bula, is not to go to the poor, but is to be used to increase the "splendor of the Church." Until about fifty years ago the proceeds of the bulas were divided between the Spanish Church and the Vatican, which annually had a commissary bring the indulgences to the Spanish people. Now the Archbishop of Toledo has an enormous number of bulas printed in January of each year, and the bishops, priests, and booksellers distribute them and receive their percentages in return. How much of the profit flows to Rome no longer enters the public domain, at any rate an immense sum. About two years ago an English Catholic wrote to the Vatican about this trade in indulgences in Spain. After a long silence, the oracle in Rome finally gave him the answer: any priest could tell him that the indulgence transaction in Spain was not a "sale". The Vatican knows about this shameless trade, which is a main source of money for the Spanish Church. But before the Catholics in Germany, England, and the United States, the priests seek to conceal such conditions. - According to the *Contemporary Review*, the other means used by the Church in Spain to draw money out of the people's pockets include, above all, the masses and prayers, which must be paid for dearly, the mendicant monks, whose profession is one of the most honorable in Spain, the consecrated candles, and the lottery games in the church halls and convents. For incense and consecrated candles over five million dollars are spent annually in Spain. In 1897 there were 72,077 priests, monks, and nuns in Spain, who made it their life's work to plunder the people. For money the priests stoop to dedicate with great pomp the places where the bull fights are held. They have set up a chapel for the fencers, where they can prepare themselves for the bullfight by prayer and receive the sacrament from the hands of the priests. The bloodiest combats are celebrated on the high ecclesiastical feast days. - In Germany, England and America, the papacy is constantly stimulated by Protestantism. The Philippines, Italy, and above all Spain, the most catholic of all, teach us what a pure papacy, left to itself, makes of a people.

F. B.

"The end justifies the means." Between Chaplain Dasbach and Count Hoensbroech a feud has existed for some time, in that the former offered a sum of money in case one could prove the word: "The end justifies the means" as a Jesuit principle. Chaplain Dasbach now admits that Count Hoensbroech in his last publication had proved two things from the writings of Jesuits which he had attracted. He writes in the "Trierer Landeszeitung" with regard to this publication about Count Hoensbroech: "He has proved that many Jesui-

The first proof of this is that the first two men teach that, for an important reason or for a good purpose, it is sometimes permissible to let something evil happen or to provide an opportunity for a sin, even if it could be prevented. This is the first proof. But some Jesuits go still further, and say that even in certain well-defined cases it is permissible to advise a man to commit a lesser sin, to invite him to do so, in order to prevent a greater one. This is the second proof, and with these two proofs what belongs to the matter is exhausted." Thus it is indirectly conceded that Jesuits hold in their writings the principle, "The end justifies the means." The money, of course, does not pay Dasbach. (A. E. L. K.)

Rule of the Jesuits in France. How the Jesuits did it in France in the first half of the 19th century, the "Reformation" brings the following samples: "The Jesuits had memorized from the philosopher Leibnitz the sentence: He who is master of education is master of the world. They seized the schools all the way up to the university. They knew how to work on the Minister Corbiare through all sorts of surreptitious channels and back doors, so that he had Louis XVIII sign an ordinance on February 27, 1821, in which the following remarkable sentences were to be found: The diocesan bishop will exercise the right of supervision over all official bishops of fine dioceses in matters of religion and will call upon the royal council of public education to take such measures as he deems necessary. The 'private houses of education' (mostly under the direction of the Jesuits), 'which have earned the trust of the families, will continue to belong to the private individuals, but can be converted by the royal council into grammar schools with complete class distribution and will enjoy under this title the privileges granted to the royal and communal grammar schools'. In 1821/22 the Jesuits had devised a press law, the first article of which punished with three months to five years imprisonment or a fine of 300 to 6000 Francs every conversation, every writing, every drawing which insulted or ridiculed the state religion and the other legally recognized cults. On February 10, 1825, they knew how to initiate the infamous trial on the bill concerning the church grape. In it the following injunctions appear: Any act of violence committed against consecrated vessels or the consecrated hosts is considered desecration. The desecration of consecrated vessels is punishable by simple death, the desecration of consecrated hosts by the torture of the patricides. Any theft committed in a building consecrated to the religion of the State, by the association of two or more persons at night, by force and with the aid of a burglar, a ladder, or false keys, is considered an ecclesiastical theft, and as such is punishable by death/ In 1829, the Jesuit Abbé Fraissinous raised the following question on the tribune of the legislative body: Is it not extraordinary that in the bosom of a Catholic nation the marriage of Catholics should take place like a simple contract of sale and rent? One is unanimous about this in the country and will find the means for it, although one respects the civil law to prevent marriages which cannot be consecrated by religion/ The interference of the Jesuits could be felt even in the barracks. The general Sebastiani said: 'The army is tormented by boasting and espionage. The almoners exercise a boisterous and inciting influence there. The soldier, who is forced to attend all religious exercises, to perform an overabundance of ceremonies, mumbles new expressions of reverence which are prescribed for him, and sees, not without displeasure, the wages for duties disappear, which turn him into vain outward appearances of a false piety.

to be hunted down. To advance in rank, it is not necessary to attend a war school, but to present many confession slips/ This was also the case in the administrations. A chief prosecutor of the royal court at Amiens expressed himself with displeasure: 'We know that there are applicants for the positions of authorities who brazenly deceive God and deceive the people by ecclesiastical hypocrisy. What is this individual who enters the temple on the great feast days in a conspicuous suit, and who, advancing slowly in order to be better seen, psalm-mods with his lips the praises of the Deity? This is a hypocrite by calculation, of whom some pious and trustworthy personages should boast the conversion, and recommend him themselves with warmth to the authorities.'" Alfréd Bénézech, from whom the above data are taken, remarks: "The Jesuit regiment was a foul water, wherein the tartufuses multiplied to infinity, and frolicked in it with pleasure. We have enough of this to give us an idea of the benefits with which Ultramontanism would lavish our country when it regained control of it. " F. B.

The unspeakably rotten conditions in Rome at the time of the priestly rule form the subject of an account in the supplement to the Munich "Allg. Ztg.", in which, among other things, reference is made to the records of the German artist Kops. Much of what Kopf reports from Rome before 1870 could not have happened in any other country in Europe, with the exception of Turkey. Kopf saw a murderer who had taken refuge in the monastery of the Padri di Gesü e Maria playing bocce with the monks in its garden every day. The police soldier posted as a guard at the gate, who was to arrest the murderer as soon as he voluntarily left the monastery, disappeared one day, and soon after the murderer also disappeared, and the monks continued to play boccia without him. The French, who did not respect the right of asylum of the churches and convents, even that of S. Luigi Francese, were considered barbarians by the people because of their intervention against Poveretti, who had had the misfortune to come into conflict with the laws. One man, whom Kopf used as a model for a statue of Prometheus, had already been handed over to the criminal court for murder, but the intercession of the priest of the Parrochia S. Andrea della Fratte was sufficient to free him immediately, and the matter had no further consequences for him. The 50 or so priests of Rome possessed a kind of omnipotence. Without their testimony no one received employment, no one a passport abroad, without their support no business enterprise could prosper. Naturally, there was a great rush to the clergy, and every family that possessed a zio prete was considered fortunate. They disposed of the large sums that flowed to them entirely at their own discretion, and especially the fact that the endowment of poor brides with a wedding gift, often relatively important, depended entirely on their favor, gave rise to serious abuses; Kopf also relates a case he experienced himself here. Next to the clerical, the civil service career was the most sought after in certain circles. Often the office was passed on from father to son, the boy was entered in the ranking list immediately after birth, in which he moved up as regularly as the arbitrariness that prevailed here allowed. At forty the clerks were entitled to a pension, and could then make signore. The Roman chancery rooms were full of people who, behind large green boxes that concealed them completely, spent a few hours a day doing whatever they liked or sleeping. At the post office, letters were traded. For a letter from Germany Kopf was asked 5 lire; when he refused to accept, they asked him what he wanted to give, and he received the letter for 2 lire. Before the

even the strangers were by no means safe from the brutal arbitrariness of the police. A young Russian painter had spent the night drinking wine with Roman friends, one of whom had made a green-white-red tricolour out of snuff rags. The police, who had no special authority to violate the domicile by day or night, came and arrested the Russian with the others, even though he had only been a spectator of this state crime. He was kept in prison for five weeks without interrogation, and no attention was paid to the protestations of his innocence, nor were his letters to his Consul forwarded, and on his release he was told never to speak of the matter. He preferred to leave Rome. What Goethe wrote in 1786, overwhelmed by the impressions received on crossing the border of Tuscany, that this state only seemed to preserve itself because the earth did not want to swallow it, was literally true until September 20, 1870, when it really did swallow it.

(A. E. L. K.)

Protestant devotion to Mary. An Irishwoman who had become Protestant had to be admitted to a hospital which was served by Roman-Papal sisters. One of the sisters came down hard on the patient for her conversion. "You Protestants," she once said, "have no respect at all for the Virgin Mary, of whom it is said from the mouths of angels: You are the most blessed of women." - "No respect?" replied the invalid; "I should like to know how many Catholics there are who seek to obey the one commandment of Mary as faithfully as we Protestants do." - "Which one?" asked the sister. "Well, just her only one," repeated the invalid, "when, at the wedding of Cana, Mary commanded the people, 'Do what he tells you.'"

The British Foreign Bible Society will commemorate the anniversary of its founding one hundred years ago on March 7, 1904. At the suggestion of a plain clergyman, Thomas Charles, who had encountered an actual hunger for Bibles in Wales, this Society was founded for the purpose of placing in the hands of every man, in his own language, God's message to him. And since then, that message, the Holy Scriptures, have been distributed in 180 million copies in nearly 400 different language forms by this Society alone. In 88 of these languages there is at least a translation of the whole Bible, and in 74 other languages a complete New Testament. It employs over 850 Bible messengers in all parts of the world and supports 650 Bible women who are in the service of 36 different missionary societies, including German and Swiss ones. When it was founded, an English Bible in 8° cost 12 Marks, while an equal Bible can now be supplied by it at 2 Marks, which makes it easily accessible to the impecunious. - During the past year translations or revisions in over 100 languages have been in progress. Hundreds of missionaries, linguists and native helpers are divided into various committees and continue this world-wide work. Each Protestant mission is supplied by the British and Foreign Bible Society for the most part with the Holy Scriptures which it needs for its work among the heathen. As a rule, the Bibles or parts of the Bible are given to the missions under "mission conditions," that is, the desired books are sent to the missionaries free of charge, and they reimburse the Bible Society for the net proceeds after deducting the expenses incurred by the distribution. Never has an earnest request for the granting of sacred writings, which has come to the Bible Society from the mission stations, been refused. Still has the wishes of a

The British and Foreign Bible Society has taken into account the needs of the Church in publishing the Holy Scriptures in a new language, as soon as the translation offered could be sufficiently authenticated as good and correct. During the past year the British and Foreign Bible Society has employed 745 colporteurs in foreign countries. These have distributed over 1,400,000 copies of the Holy Scriptures. The Society has spent over 850,000 marks in one year for colportage. In the Orient 621 native Bible women have been supported, who have been active among the heathen women under the direction and supervision of nearly 50 different missionary societies and associations. During the year 1901-02 the Society has published 939,700 Bibles, 1,364,000 New Testaments, and 2,763,500 portions or special books of the Scriptures-a total of over 5,067,000 copies. The total number exceeds anything that had ever been accomplished in one year before. Of every 100 copies issued, 19 were whole Bibles, 27 New Testaments, and 54 portions of Holy Scripture. In the past year the Society has received 4,720,000 Marks from all its various sources of support, while it has been forced to spend 4,820,000 Marks, so that it has to contend with a deficit of 100,000 Marks. But it cannot cut back anywhere without damaging a most important work. (A. E. L. K.)

The liberals issued the **following appeal for the Berlin church elections**: "The orthodox majorities make no secret of their regressive and anti-cultural attitude. Their views are contrary to what the majority of Protestant citizens believe and feel. The orthodox majorities cling to the letter of the traditional confessional writings. The orthodox majorities prescribe in an unprotestant spirit what you are to believe, and call everything that is not agreeable to them heresy. The orthodox majorities have no understanding for the professional and commercial interests of our fellow citizens or deliberately work against them. The orthodox majorities have no hesitation in imposing increasing church taxes on the shoulders of the people, in addition to other heavy burdens. Protestant fellow-citizens! Do you again want the reputation of the Protestant Church as the Church of the Reformation to diminish in wide circles and the common good to suffer as a result of your non-consecration in the elections? Examine who recommends candidates to you for the church elections and who is recommended to you! Vote for men who stand up for the freedom of scientific research! Vote for men who do not want the autonomy and independence of our schools to be touched! Vote for men who will represent your interests! Elect men whose gaze is directed forward, who abhor reaction in any form! Elect men who will vote in parish elections only for clergymen who uphold the heritage of the Reformation in a liberal spirit! Vote for men who advocate thrift and reduction of church taxes in church administration!" - The liberals in Berlin are for the most part people who want nothing at all to do with the church. They would also, like the unbelievers in the large cities of America, care little about the church if they did not have to pay church taxes. This unjust compulsion increases their natural enmity against the church to bitterness and malice.

F. B.

"**Letters from the Concil.**" At the family celebration of the Old Catholic congregation of Munich, Prof. Friedrich made interesting announcements about the "Letters from the Conciliar" published in the "Allg. Ztg." in Augsburg during the Vatican Council, which caused such a great stir throughout the whole world.

world aroused. He reported: "I was in Rome at that time, and it was therefore generally said that I was the one who wrote these letters. Since no one of all those involved is alive any more than I am, I will announce today who wrote the letters, since no one after me would be able to do so. The matter was like this: I wrote letters to Döllinger from time to time from Rome, as did Lord Acton. From these letters and from articles that appeared in French newspapers, Döllinger had an enormous amount of material, and from this material he created the letters that appeared under 'Quirinus' in the 'Allg. Zeitung'. He edited the letters from day to day and passed them on. Nobody knew that. It was believed that he was not concerned with the Conciliar. The secret was kept by the fact that Döllinger never personally communicated with the editors of the -Allg. Zeitung*. He had his intermediary for this. This was the late Professor Johannes Huber. He transmitted the letters to the editorial staff without mentioning his name. However, it also happened that letters arrived directly from Rome to the editorial office. These letters were from Count Louis Arco, who was then an attaché in Rome and had a profound knowledge of the subject. This is how the Letters from the Concil* came into being."

In a review of **"Jörn Uhl",** the widely read and praised novel by the Danish pastor Frenssen, the Kropper Kirchl. Anzeiger (Kropper Church Gazette) says: "Some thoughts and concerns of a Protestant clergyman about Frenssen's -Jörn Uhl* by J. Roos, pastor in Innien": "The author uses this book to discuss firstly: What is Frenssen's position on God's law? and proves that Frenssen does not know the concept of sin. He does not know that the law is a demand of God, and that every transgression of the law is a sinning against God. Secondly, the author examines what Frenssen says about faith, and there the author proves conclusively that Frenssen is drawing a caricature of the Lord Jesus. He does not know the Son of God, but only the noble Nazarene. Thirdly, the author weighs the question: What does Frenssen think of the word? And he proves that Frenssen thinks very impiously of God's Word and does not esteem God's Word as God's Word. Fourth, he considers the question: What does Frenssen know of the revelation of God? He proves that Frenssen curiously picks apart the Word of Revelation and then lets the loose leaves of Scripture fly to the winds. The result of his investigations is that Frenssen is hostile to Christianity, just as he himself is hostile to Luther's disciples. The very fact that a preacher of the Gospel writes in this way will be particularly damaging to Christianity. There is a fine poison in Frenssen's book which, I fear, will have a very disastrous effect." - Frenssen resigned his position in the Danish Church. F. B.

"The Babylonian-Assyrian Cuneiform Inscriptions and their Significance for the Old Testament." Dr. Bezold of Heidelberg gave a lecture on this subject in Karlsruhe, in which he also said: "The Babylonian king Chammurabi cannot yet be proved with certainty to be the Amraphel of the first Book of Moses, so that the time of the Biblical arch-father Abraham still remains undetermined. There is no hint of monotheism in the cuneiform inscriptions, and the Hebrew Sabbath cannot be traced back to a Babylonian institution. Nor has the Biblical Fall any analogy in the monuments so far excavated in Mesopotamia."

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 49. October 1903. No. 10.

Recent Pentateuch Criticism.

(Continued.)

II.

On the history of criticism. 1.

According to the clear and uniform statements of the Old Testament about the origin of the Pentateuch, the ancient Jewish church unanimously held Moses to be the author of the five books. The older Talmud expresses the opinion that Joshua wrote the last eight verses of the Law, which tell of Moses' death and burial, Deut. 34, 5-12, because the fifth verse begins with the words: "So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there"; but this is a view that is not reprehensible and which we will discuss later in the third part of this work. According to Philo ("Life of Moses"), Josephus ("Jewish Antiquities" 1), and the younger Talmudists, these verses also come from Moses himself. Nor did the ancient Christian Church, which had in addition to the testimony of the Old Testament the mighty testimony of Christ and the apostles, ever raise the slightest doubt as to the Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch. Only pagan opponents of Christianity, such as Celsus and Julian, and Gnostic heretics, such as Ptolemy, the Nazarenes, and the unknown author of the pseudo-Clementine homilies, have raised objections, but these do not refer to the Mosaic version, but rather to the divine origin and content, to the truthfulness and authority of the five books, which therefore, even according to recent critics, have no critical significance. Still less can one refer to the often cited passage of Jerome, where he in

1) Josephus writes: "But he (Moses) described his own death in the sacred books" *(γέγραφε* ὁ' αυτόν *εν τα~ις Ιεραις βίβλοις τε-ῦνεώτα*). (IV, 8, 48.)

Reference to the words, "And hath no man known his (Moses') grave until this day," Deut. 34:6, says: "Surely the -today' is to be understood of that time in which history is woven together; whether thou wilt call Moses the author of the Pentateuch, or Ezra the restorer of that work, I do not protest against it." 1) For evidently the Father of the Church here refers to the Jewish legend of the restoration of the Old Testament Scriptures by Ezra. This legend, however, in no way denied the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, but only reported that Ezra had restored the sacred writings, which had been lost at the destruction of Jerusalem, literally and exactly by inspiration. It was common among the Fathers of the Church, and thus Jerome arrives at these approving words, which, of course, it never deserved. 2)

In the Middle Ages, some more liberal Jewish scholars thought that they could find parts in the Pentateuch that pointed beyond the time of Moses, so-called post-Mosaics. Thus an otherwise little known scholar, Isaac, about the year 900, declared the words of Genesis 36:31 ff: "But the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before the children of Israel held kings, are these" to be post-Mosaic and written only in the time of King Jehoshaphat, but was rebuked for it by later rabbis. The well-known Jewish grammarian and exegete Aben Ezra († 1167), who mentions but emphatically disapproves of this assertion of Isaac, has in his Pentateuch commentary on Gen. 12:6."For at that time the Canaanites dwelt in the land," he made the remark that this statement probably indicated that Canaan had been conquered, that the words were therefore probably written in post-Mosaic times, but that Hai otherwise considered "the Pentateuch on the whole without doubt to be a work of Moses." 3) Even if some other passages had aroused his surprise, so that he called them secret notes of the Pentateuch (Gen. 22, 14: "this day"; Deut. 3, 11: "Is not the bed of Og in Rabbath?"), so "it does not follow with certainty from his statements that he considered them non-Mosaic"; only to Deut. 34, 5. he still remarks: "According to my knowledge it stands thus, that from here on Joshua wrote." 4) The Jewish exegete and philosopher Abrabanel (f 1508) has it in his Pentateuch Commentary

1) "Certe *hodiernus dies* illius temporis existimandus est, quo historia contexta est: Sive Mosen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi, sive Esram ejusdem instauratorem operis, non recuso." (Hieronymi Lucubrationes. 1553. II, 8. Contra Helvidium.)

2) This fable is told in detail in the apocryphal fourth book of Ezra, Cap. 14, which is also found in some old German Bibles.

3) Strack, "Introduction to the Old Testament". Fourth edition, p. 28.

4) Citirt bei E. König, "Zur Pentateuchforschung". "Theologisches Litteraturblatt", XVI- p. 570.

several times found it remarkable that in the Pentateuch it was often written: "beyond the Jordan" instead of: "on this side of the Jordan", Gen. 50, 10. 5 Mos. 1, 1. 5. etc., which probably indicates that the writer had lived in the land of Canaan, thus was not Moses. On the Christian side, the most respected exegete of the later Middle Ages, Nicolaus de Lyra († 1340), expressed his doubts in his Bible works about Moses having handed over the law to the Levites after Deut. 31:9, and then the Pentateuch continuing after all. But that is all that can be brought from the pre-Reformation period, and we see that all concerns were directed only against individual passages and expressions.

From the time of the Reformation, we are especially interested in Luther's position. And as in other pieces of biblical criticism, so also in the question of the Pentateuch the Reformer is gladly described by modern critics as standing on a freer standpoint and taken for their views, but also here quite wrongly. The following sayings of his are mainly to be considered. Concerning the words just quoted about the kings of Edom, Gen. 36:31, he remarks: "But it is asked, Whether these princes and kings were before or after Moses? If they were after Moses, he was not able to write this, but this addition was made by another, as the last part is in the fifth book of Moses. For he did not say of himself, Deut. 34:10: And there arose no prophet in Israel henceforth, like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face? There are other things that are told there about the grave of Moses. Unless thou wilt say that he saw and prophesied these things beforehand by a prophetic spirit." In his interpretation of the fifth book of Moses, Luther says of Cap. 31: "And thus Moses concludes his sermon in this chapter. For the. 32nd chapter contains this song, the 33rd chapter the benedictions; the 34th chapter Moses cannot have written." 2) And he then repeats this at chapter 34, saying, "This chapter Moses did not write, but Joshua or Eleazar, unless thou wilt say that he described his death in this way, since he knew it beforehand." 3) But all these words clearly show that Luther's misgivings were also directed only against individual passages and expressions, similar to Lyra's and the medieval Jewish scholars. We will consider these passages later and look at them more closely, and will then see that Luther was by no means expressing modern critical views. He certainly regarded the Pentateuch as a book of Moses, as almost innumerable passages of his great commentary on Genesis show. Again and again the name of Moses as the writer recurs. By way of example, let us shred a few passages here. In the story of the flood, Luther says: "Others, so weak of spirit

1) St. L. ed. II, 1010. 2) III, 1614. 3) III, 1636.

are, may think that therefore Moses so often repeats and imagines the same, that since he wrote such things, such great wrath of God was fierce in his heart.... Moses uses short words, but repeats them often." 1) In the history of the Cainites he remarks: "Moses omits all these things, because it was too long and too rambling to write them. .. Thus he very recently describes the flood." 2) Concerning Gen. 4, 9. he remarks: "But Moses in descriptions of such things is not of so many words as the heathen." 3) And on Jacob's vision of the ladder of heaven, he says, "What Moses wrote of the patriarchs, he wrote not chiefly for their sakes; for they had no need of these writings, and are now dead and gathered unto their fathers: but that the church and congregation of God might be instructed and strengthened thereby unto the end of the world."4) The higher critic Strack, of course, asserts of the Reformer: "Luther had neither leisure nor inclination to occupy himself with critical investigations; yet, in harmony with other manifestations of his consciousness of evangelical freedom, he occasionally expressed: What would it do if Moses had not written this (the Pentateuch) himself" 5) - but Strack omits to specify where Luther is supposed to have said this "occasionally". We only know the statement in the "Table Talks": "Whoever admits that the evangelists write God's Word, we will well meet. But whoever denies this, I will not exchange a word with him. For then this also occurs in Christianity: Against him who denies the main reason, there is no need to dispute. Yet all Jews, pagans, and Turks say that the Bible is the holy Scripture. For this book has the highest testimony. And it does no harm if some say that the five books of Moses were not written by Moses, for they are Moses'." 6) If Strack has this passage in mind-as is probable-it speaks, quite apart from the well-known unreliability of the "Table Talks," not for but against him, and it almost seems as if he had not read Luther's words in context at all, after the manner of many a German theologian.

The first to entertain and express real, definite doubts about the Mosaic version of the Pentateuch was the well-known Swarm.

1) I, 542. 2) I, 408 f. 3) I, 340.

4) II, 403. 5) Introduction, p. 28.

6) XXII, 25. In the Erlangen edition, Luther's words are offered in the following recension: "After this, someone said over the table that many thought that the first book of the five books of Most was not written by Moses himself. To this Doctor Martin Luther answered, and said, 'What does this add? if Moses had not written it, yet it is Most's book, for this book alone writes in the very best and most proper way how the world was created.'" (57, 35.)

The author of the five books is the same as the spiritual leader Carlstadt, who wrote in 1520: "It is certain that Moses gave the law received from God to the people, but to whom the wording of the five books and the thread of the account belong can be doubted.) And in a later place he says: "It may be denied that Moses was not the author of the five books, because after the burial of Moses we find the same thread of exposition.'" Here, for the first time, as far as we know, we hear expressed a main principle of modern criticism, the principle of linguistic proof, namely, that one can infer the author or non-author of a work from the peculiarities of language, vocabulary, and style. And this is a very precarious principle, as we shall later see from incontestable examples. Yet, as far as we know, this debate of Carlstadt's remained completely unnoticed in those days. 3) The Protestant Church did not allow itself to be misled by Carlstadt in its belief in the statements of Scripture concerning the Pentateuch, any more than the Roman Church was later misled by the view of the Catholic Masius, who assumed a later reworking of the Pentateuch by Ezra or some other man of God and said in 1574 at the beginning of his Commentary on the Book of Joshua: "Good conjectures can easily be adduced that the work of Moses, which is called the Pentateuch, was patched up, as it were, long after Moses, by the insertion, at least here and there, of concluding words and sentences, and was by all means more completely produced." 4) As a reason for his opinion Masius cites especially the occurrence of later proper names (e. g. Hebron, Gen. 13, 18., cf. Jos. 14, 15. Richt. 1, 10.; Dan, Gen. 14, 14. cf. Jos. 19, 47. Richt. 18, 29.), which we will come to later.

Soon, however, the formal attacks on the Mosaic version of the Pentateuch began. These attacks were always launched by deniers of the divine revelation of salvation, and were immediately rejected by the church with vigor and convincing reasons. Such forerunners of modern criticism were the French fantasist Peyrere, the Dutch

1) "Certum est, Mosen legem Dei divinitus acceptam populo dedisse, verum cujus sit dictio quinque librorum atque sermonis filum, dubitari potest." (Libellus de canonicis scripturis, § 81.)

2) „Defendi posse, Mosen non fuisse scriptorem quinque librorum, quoniam sepulto Mose filum orationis idem invenimus." (§ 85.)

3) Possibly the above passage from Luther's Table Talks has reference to Carlstadt's position, since there were no other opponents of the Mosaicity of the Pentateuch at that time.

4) "Mosis opus, quod vocant πενχάτειχχχ, longo post Mosen tempore, interjectis saltem hic illic verborum et sententiarum clausulis, veluti sarcitum atque omnino explicatius redditum esse conjecturae bonae afferri facile possunt." (Citirt bei E. König, l. c.- p. 570.)

Jew Spinoza, the English freethinker Hobbes and the freethinking French Catholic Richard Simon. Peyrere, by birth a Jew, then a Huguenot, then a Catholic and died in 1676 as a Jesuit, was the first to claim in a frivolous manner that the Pentateuch could not be regarded as the coherent work of one author. The Book of Five was composed of various writings, which were also based on the records of Moses; thus one had to explain the numerous obscurities, confusions, omissions and repetitions. Peyrere referred to passages such as Deut. 21, 14. f. Deut. 3, 11. and expressed these views in his whimsical book on the preadamites, published in 1655, namely, that Adam and Eve were only the progenitors of the Jews, while all heathen nations were descended from older people, the so-called preadamites. Since he was therefore imprisoned and forced to recant, his critical opinions remained without further consequences. Much more significant and momentous for the future, on the other hand, were Spinoza's remarks in his "Tractatus theologico-politicus," published in 1670. This pantheistic, rationalistic Jew, for whom there was neither divine revelation nor miracles nor prophecy, is indeed one of the arch-fathers of modern higher criticism. Of his work, one of today's radical critics, Eornill, says quite effusively: "In an almost classical manner, the Disciplin (the Old Testament introduction) is here given task and goal, and with ingenious intuition many of its most important results are anticipated." 1) And it is really the case that very many critical views which are commonplace among the present Old Testament critics have already been indicated by Spinoza. Referring to the above-mentioned Aben Ezra, whom he calls the first impugner of the authenticity of the Book of Five, Spinoza flatly denies the Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch, and says in express words, "that the five books of Moses were not written by this, but by someone who lived many centuries after Moses." 2) He finds proof of this in the passages which Aben Ezra calls mysterious, but to which he adds others which are post-Moses, such as Gen. 14, 14 (Dan), Gen. 36, 31 (the kings of Edom), Gen. 16, 35 (the duration of the desert food), Gen. 12, 3 (Moses' own praise); he also emphasizes the fact that Moses is always spoken of in the third person. But on the other hand he also finds hints of a real literary activity of Moses in 4 Mos. 21, 14, compared with 2 Mos. 17, 14; in 2 Mos. 24, 4. 7. and in 5 Mos. 1, 5. 31, 9. His view can be summarized in this way: The historical books of the Old Testament from Genesis to Kings.

1) "Introduction to the Old Testament." Second Edition, p. 5.
2) "Tractatus," cap. 8.

form a large, coherent work of history, which throughout pursued the purpose to teach the words and ordinances of Moses - for Spinoza still considers Moses to be the lawgiver of the people of Israel - and to prove them to be true by the outcome of the events. The work of this author, who is unknown to us, but was probably Ezra, consisted essentially in the collection of materials from various authors; he did not come to a complete order and to the reconciliation of the contradictions. The Pentateuch is called the "Book of Moses" only because it deals mainly with Moses.

Already a little before Spinoza, the English freethinker Hobbes in his "**Leviathan**" (1651) had established the principle, which is admittedly just as deceptive as the proof from the language, that one must determine from the content of the biblical writings themselves their time of writing, had therefore described the Pentateuch for internal reasons as impossibly written by Moses and said that the Pentateuch seems to be rather written about Moses than by Moses. 1) Only the laws 5 Mos. 11-27 were written by Moses himself. And soon after Spinoza, the rationalist Arminian Clericus had described a number of passages in the Pentateuch as being of post-Mosaic origin, and generally attributed the writing of the work to Moses and to a Samaritan priest, 2 Kings 17:26 ff; but he soon found himself refuted and retracted his errors and doubts in a special treatise. On the other hand, the expositions of the free-minded French Oratorian Richard Simon in his "Critical History of the Old Testament," beginning in 1678, made a lasting impression, and he may be called, next to Spinoza, a second arch-father of modern criticism. Simon shows in this work extensive erudition, skilful summary and utilization of the works of others, and elegant French style of exposition, but also, as Strack also acknowledges, "several times lack of love of truth". 2) And the fact that his book was confiscated in France because of its heretical views only gained him even more attention, especially since Simon knew how to polemicize against fine opponents as fast as sharply. He now attributes the written version of the laws to Moses, but claims that the historical parts of the five books and the Pentateuch in its present form could not have been written by Moses. He puts forward the following theory of the origin of the Pentateuch: In all states of the Orient there were official historians, historiographers, public annalists. So also, probably already since Moses' time and first employed by him, with the Hebrews, only with the difference that with these they had to be

1) "Videtur Pentateuchus potius de Mose quam a Mose scriptus. "(Leviathan III, 33.)
2) Introduction, p. 5.

were preachers, the prophets. These historiographers not only recorded what was important for their time, but also changed, shortened and increased, as seemed good to them according to the circumstances of the time, what had been written by their predecessors. Ezra or probably still later ones collected everything and formed the Pentateuch, in general our whole Old Testament, from the material available to them, which they used with much freedom. - Everyone sees at once that in this view of Simon there is not even the slightest reverence for God's Word, but simply human wit is elevated to judge the Old Testament and the statements of Scripture are contradicted from beginning to end.

(To be continued.) F-

Theological Dicta Classica.

(Found in Luther's works.)

De Scriptura Sacra .

(Continued.)

B. New Testament.

a. "Now the Holy Spirit speaks through St. John." (VII, 1403, § 23.)

b. "St. John did not bring forth his Gospel by human will, but he is impelled by the Holy Spirit, who is a Spirit of truth; therefore he will certainly not deceive us." (VII, 1521, 8 199.)

c. "We are to remain at home with our reason, not wanting to fall in and speculate out, but to believe the Holy Spirit who spoke through Moses and John." (VII, 1401, § 20.)

d. "They are bright, dry, and clear words, and St. John wrote them thus with great diligence, and did it by the command of the Holy Spirit, that it might be clearly and plainly spoken." (VII, 2091, § 318.)

e. "These are St. John's, or rather the Holy Spirit's speeches." (Ill, 2833, § 61.)

f. "For St. Paul speaks this from the Holy Spirit, who is a Spirit of truth." (IX, 1451.)

g. "They"-Moses and Paul-"must both write rightly; for the Holy Spirit is not contrary to himself." (Ill, 2854, § 89.)

Every history - even that which is offensive to the so-called fine feelings - has been written down by the Holy Spirit. So Luther teaches that every word in the Bible is God's word.

8. "But what **desire hath** the Holy Ghost to speak such things? He is the Master, who knows what he should have written." (111, 241, § 3. **Anno** 1527.)

a. ***Nota***. "It is a loose history (Gen. 8) to reckon humanly. But God does not judge as men do." (I. c.)

b. "And the Holy Ghost hath a chaste mouth and a pure heart." (Ad Hohel. 7, 1. V, 2480, § 2. **Anno** 1538.)

c. "The mouth of the Holy Ghost is chaste and pure, and is not ashamed to speak of the marriage state." (Ad Gen. 4, 1. I, 442, 8 11.)

d. "The Holy Ghost hath no light tongue." (II, 2306.)

e. "Now it is written (Gen. 38:27-30) in the holy scriptures, and the Holy Ghost wrote it, which hath so pure a mouth and pen as we, that I know not how to put it more highly than this. If any man have purer mouth and ears than he, let him stand; but if he be not afraid nor ashamed to write, let us not be ashamed to read and hear it. The Holy Ghost knoweth well what he hath done." (111,342. **Anno** 1527.)

f. "And so the Holy Spirit (Gen. 38) descends there with His most pure mouth, and speaks of abominable sin and abominable incest." (II, 1761.)

g. "Dear, why does the Holy Spirit write such a thing (Gen. 29) and hold it up for us to read, as if we could be corrected from such a shameful deed?" (II, 708, 8 66. Vids also §§ 69. 74. 77.)

h. "And is wonder that the Holy Ghost should be troubled to describe such a thing, namely, how Rachel envied her sister Leah." (II, 784, 8 28.)

i. "This (Gen. 30, 14-16.) has not been held out to us in vain by the Holy Spirit, that we should read it, teach it, and believe it." (II, 831, 8 99.)

j. "And these also are but natural things; but the Holy Ghost (Gen. 29, 9-12.) hath caused them to be written for this cause, that no man should think that they were shameful or unseemly things." (II, 697, 8 48. Vids also 8 49.)

k. "Wherefore we ought to read the holy Scriptures in another and better way. And therefore I repeat this so often, and imagine it to you, that we are not to look at these low and altogether carnal things with carnal eyes, but with spiritual eyes; and then we shall see the whimsical counsel of the Holy Ghost in such descriptions." (II, 793, § 42.)

l. "Therefore let the word of God be kept in equal regard, he speaketh whatsoever he will, and sucketh it always." (III, 337.)

m. "The battle is now told, not that God should desire to tell how the heathen contend and fight with one another." (Ill., 361. **Anno** 1527. **Vide** Gen. 14, 1-16.)

n. "And hath such household unpleasantness and vexation the Holy Ghost caused to be described to us for our consolation." (I, 1477, § 49. Ad Gen. 16, 4.)

o. "That the Holy Ghost is the Master of this book (Genesis), who hath pleasure himself, that he may thus play and jest to describe such (Gen. 30, 14-16.) trifling, childish things, and which are of no value, and the same he holds out to us to be taught in the churches, as unto great correction." (II, 828, § 94.)

p. "Let not such histories (Gen. 20) be passed over so diligently, which the Holy Ghost hath written and left unto the church, that they should be read, that thereby the faith might be edified and increased." (I, 1961, § 5.)

q. "But it must be known that in allegories (Hohel. 7, 1.) the Holy Spirit looks more to the utility of the thing than to the actual nature of it." V, 2481, § 3.)

r. "Moses wrote many things about natural rivers, both male and female, both awake and asleep, of which no one is now allowed to speak publicly; our ears have become so much purer than the mouth of the Holy Spirit; we are ashamed when we are not ashamed, and we are not ashamed when we are ashamed. (XI, 263, § 308. Ev. on the Feast of the Three Kings.)

9. "Moses is the fountain from which all the holy prophets and apostles drew the divine wisdom and art of salvation, how to be saved, by inspiration of the Holy Spirit." (V, 1081, § 1. **Anno** 1534.)

The holy scripture is perfect, free from error.

(Dicta 10-16.)

10. "As little as the reason and evidence of the New Testament is to be despised, so much is the Old Testament to be esteemed." (XIV, 2. **Anno** 1523.)

Nota. Both Testaments - the Old and the New Testament - are God's holy Word to Luther. "Therefore let go of your arrogance and your feelings, and think of this Scripture (the Old Testament) as of the very highest, noblest sanctuary, as of the treasure trove that can never be dug up enough, so that you may find the divine wisdom, which God presents here so foolishly and badly that it dampens all arrogance. Here shalt thou find the swaddling clothes and the manger, where Christ lieth within.

the angel also directs the shepherds. Luc. 2." (XIV, 2, § 3.) "The letter of the Old Testament loves to rhyme with the New Testament." (Ill., 2899, § 148.)

11. "It is certain that Scripture may not disagree with itself." (XX, 994. **Anno** 1527.)

Nota. From his immortal writing: "That these words: This is my body" etc..

12. "It is impossible that Scripture should be contrary to itself." (VIII, 2140. **Anno** 1535.)

Nota. From his **Aureum Comm, ad Gal.**.. In the preface Luther says: "In my heart this One Article, faith in Christ, reigns; from it, through it, and to it all my theological thinking flows day and night; yet, as I see, of such high, broad, and profound wisdom I have grasped only weak firstlings and fragments." Whoever wants to study the most important writing of his dogmatic works should take this writing in hand and learn how Luther bowed deeply before the Holy Scriptures. Jokingly, Luther later remarked, "The Epistle to the Galatians is my epistle, in which I have confided; it is my Käthe von Bora." (The young theologian will excuse these interpolation words; the old Lutheran theologian appreciates them).

13. "The Scripture agrees in every part." (Vl, 268. **Anno** 1532.)

14. "Give glory to the Holy Ghost, that he may be more learned than thou." (Ill, 23. **Anno** 1527.)

Nota. "Whether we meet not the cause, let us give the Holy Ghost the glory, that he knoweth better than we." (Ill, 39, 8 15.) "We must give room to the Holy Spirit, and say that he knows better, neither we understand." (Ill, 42, § 20.)

15. "I believe that in the Scriptures God speaks, who is true." (XIV, 1112.)

Nota. "Dear to yield or change God's word, stands not with God himself." (XVII, 1679.)

Why not? God can no more contradict himself in his speech revealed through prophets and apostles than he can contradict himself in his nature. "But in the holy Scriptures alone we ought to hear, to believe, and to conclude with certainty in our hearts that God is true, however much the doctrine of faith, of which God speaks in his words, may seem to human reason to be foolish and inconsistent." (V, 650. 325.)

"In Scripture the former agrees with the latter." (St. L. ed. I, 654.)

"The Holy Ghost is no fool nor drunkard, That should speak A tittle, much less A word in vain." (Ill, 2805. **Anno** 1543. "Interpretation of the Last Words of David.")

"Therefore we are assuredly to take it for this, and to believe that the Holy Ghost hath not lied." (V, 127, 8 45.)

"None of the same (sacred Scripture) descriptors ever erred." (XV, 1758. **Anno** 1521.)

16. "The prophets do not bring their thoughts or discretion, but God's Word, which the Lord Himself has spoken, and for this reason cannot or may not be hindered or changed by any means." (VI, 2169, § 1. "Ausl. d. Proph. Joel.")

Nota. "Moses' and the prophets' teaching does not come from reason and human wisdom." (XIII, 1149.)

"David calls the Holy Spirit, to whom he gives all that the prophets prophesy." (Ill, 2797, § 9.)

"The prophets do not bring what they have conceived and thought good, but what they have heard from God Himself, and He who created all things has shown and instructed them either by dreams or by visions; the same they reveal and present to us. Num. 12, 6." (VI, 2170, § 2.)

"The Holy Spirit is wise, and makes the prophets wise also." (VI, 3094.)

"A prophet is called one who has his mind from God without means, to whom the Holy Spirit puts the word in his mouth." (Ill, 1172.)

"Prophets are those who have the doctrine of God without any means." (Ill, 1172.) So Luther also teaches a personal inspiration. The prophets and apostles were **viri inspirati,** as the systematists express themselves.

How this happened cannot be explained. This inspiration of the prophets and apostles is an article of faith, and can now and never be constructed by reason, but must be believed. And this on the basis of the word: "The natural man hears nothing of the Spirit of God." For this reason we find - as far as I know - no passage in Luther in which he would have dealt with the manner of the inspiration of Scripture. "Cursed unbelief and the afflicted flesh make us neither see nor regard that God speaks to us in the Scriptures." (IX, 1395.)

(To be continued.)

Literature.

The fundamental difference in the doctrine of conversion and election of grace. Lecture delivered before the "free conference" at Watertown, Wis. on April 29, 1903, by F. Pieper. Together with an appeal to all Lutherans to form a judgment on the doctrinal controversy in the American Lutheran Church. St. Louis, Mo. **Concordia Publishing House**. Price: single 25 cents postage free, by the dozen 20 cents per copy and postage.

That there is still much ignorance within the Lutheran Church about the doctrine of conversion and election by grace, and especially about what the Missouri Synod teaches and has ever taught about conversion and election by grace, has repeatedly come to our attention in the past few months. Yes, there is still much room for instruction. In the present writing, not all questions concerning the doctrine of conversion and election by grace are answered, but the point where the paths of Missourians and Ohioans diverge is clearly and genuinely theological laid bare. This point is denoted by the question, "Cur alii prae aliis?" In other words: If God wills to convert and make all men blessed, and it is God alone who converts and makes men blessed: how is it that some are converted and made blessed before others? Synergists and Calvinists think they have solved this mystery. In truth, however, they have only cut the knot by denying either universalis gratia or sola gratia. Dr. Pieper summarizes the position of the Missouri Synod on this question in the following sentences: "First, we know why those are converted and saved who are actually converted and saved: it is God's grace alone in Christ. Secondly, we also know from Scripture why those are not converted and do not become blessed who actually remain unconverted and perish: it is their fault alone. Third, we are not able to give a single cause of the difference, or why some are converted and others not, but can only repeat it: The cause of being blessed is in God alone; the cause of being lost is in man alone. Beyond these two points there is no human knowledge in this life. He who speaks beyond these points either speaks what has no meaning or what is manifest error. If any man puts to us the question, 'Is the cause of difference to be found in God or in man,' this question, as a petitio principii in itself, must be rejected from the outset, and we must urge a division of the question. We can answer the question on the basis of Scripture, in whom the cause of conversion and salvation lies: namely, in God. We can also answer, on the basis of Scripture, the question in whom the cause of unconversion and perdition lies, namely, in man. Beyond this we answer no questions. What lies beyond that, according to Scripture, belongs to the realm of the inscrutable ways and judgments of God." He who has grasped these points has a judgment on the division between Ohio and Missouri, and can intelligently participate in the negotiations for unification between the two. The indispensable condition for this position, however, is unconditional submission to God's Word, which is now very seldom found among theologians. If all Lutheran theologians in America would take their reason captive under the obedience of faith, not only would the deep rift between Missouri and Ohio be healed, but all Lutheran divisions would be easily and safely healed. From the present writing the reader may learn, not only how to speak rightly in the doctrine of conversion and election by grace, but in theology in general, namely, so that in all his theological statements he is guided solely by the clear word of Holy Scripture, - that truly Christian and genuine theological art, which alone is able to heal all the rifts of Christendom. This writing of Dr. Pieper's is an Eirenicon in the best sense of the word. F. B.

Trial and Self-Conviction of Pope Leo XIII By *A . L. Graebner.* St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. 1903. *edition with Latin quotations* . 38 pp. 9X6. Price: 10 Cts.

The September number of the *North American Review* contains a symposium of judgments on Leo XIII, including Archbishop Ireland, who writes, among other things: ""Some day a long chapter will be written on Leo and America - his appreciative understanding of our institutions and liberties, his genial love of the country and its people, his wise and large-minded directions to the Church in America, his friendliness of attitude, in more than one instance, towards national affairs. Better pass over such matters than give of them a too brief account. Suffice it to say that in all his relations with America or Americans, Leo was Leo throughout - the large-minded, the large-hearted Pontiff; and that the very special esteem he always had for America and its institutions arose from his deep comprehension of the modern age, exemplified, he believed, to a degree in America. Speaking of America, he would say with manifest admiration, 'L'avvenire - The Future.'" - Hopefully, the future historians of whom Jreland is thinking will also have this writing of Dr. Gräbner's, which could also be titled "The Truth About Leo," at hand. Then it will be easy for them to establish not only that Leo was a fanatical enemy of Protestantism and Americanism, but also that the American press was largely under the influence of a lying Roman hierarchy. F. B.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

On the occasion of Dr. Pieper's and **Dr.** Gräbner's **25th anniversary in office,** the local supervisory authority held an appropriate celebration on October I in the auditorium of the Concordia Seminary. The ceremonial address was held by Vicepräses C. C. Schmidt, in which he said of the work that the jubilarians had done for so many years with theological students and church magazines: "Many a congregation of the Lord has been gathered, many a soul has been snatched from the realm of Satan and brought to the Lord, many a battle against Satan and the world has been victoriously fought in small and large ways by those who have been trained and made capable of such work here - the professors of this institution have a share in all these blessed achievements. But true as this is, I ask you, the members and representatives of our Synod assembled here, have we not reason to be dissatisfied with our professors? Do not our students come short under their care? Our ecclesiastical periodicals, do they really offer what is demanded in our time, and are they fitted to properly communicate the progress of ecclesiastical and theological science to preachers and laity, and to represent us before the ecclesiastical world in such a manner as to do us honor with the same? Evolution is the watchword of the day. In high schools, students hear how even in theology this theory is the law and is successfully applied. Should not our students also be able to participate in this achievement of our time? It is the custom for excellent theological institutions to be distinguished by having among their teachers people who form their own systems, or who acquaint themselves with the new systems and announce them from the lectern as well as in the journals as great progress. Have we not reason to be dissatisfied with the fact that our professors do not give our

What is the truth of the matter? Have they not brought such fame to the first seminary that they are not theologians who could worthily stand beside the others in these matters? - It is true that whoever wishes to please men in this office, the world at large, must walk in such paths. Those who know best how to unite and blend Scripture and science, theology and philosophy, the spiritual and the natural, even Christ and Belial, are the ones to whom the world, even the great ecclesiastical world, acclaims. They are called the great minds, the luminaries of theological science. But how is it possible for a man in this office to please not men but God? Must he not avoid all these ways? Must he not, as the apostle says in 1 Cor. 3:18, become a fool in this world, that he may be wise? When the apostle reviewed his fifteen years' ministry before Festus and Agrippa, he gives this brief account of it (Acts 26:22): "But by the help of God I have prospered, and stand unto this day.... And say nothing save that which the prophets said should come to pass, and Moses." Paul was a man of high learning, who had at his command rich spiritual gifts and scientific knowledge, combined with great acuteness of mind, but against the exuberant knowledge of Christ JEsu, which God had already revealed in Moses and the prophets, he considered all this to be nothing, and now placed all his strength and all his gifts at the service of the revealed Word. A theologian who wants to please God has his model here. Only divine truth may he preach, and divine truth may be to him only what the Scriptures teach. He must make it his business to search through the Scriptures and to arrange and present the divine teachings discerned from them in an orderly manner. Nor must his task be to bring the individual doctrines into a rational system and to devise an inner connection for them, but only to present them in the context in which Scripture itself places them. Even if the form of theological exposition is human, what it presents must be free from human wisdom, must be absolutely divine, must be God's Word. "He who desires to please men in this office must be liberal enough not to present anything as absolutely certain, but never to claim for his standpoint more than a relative certainty. He must also let others be right, and give praise and credit to their systems. But he who wishes to please God in this must insist that only what God has spoken can be divine truth, and that no other doctrine than that which he leads has justification in the church. As he takes his own reason captive to the obedience of the word, so he must require every man to bow to that word. - Shall we then lament the fact that our professors fear God, do not desire their own honor, do not seek to please men but God, that they are true scholars of God in the mind and spirit of the apostles of the Lord, and faithful, conscientious teachers of true theology, and that therefore they have always adhered to the once recognized pure and only saving truth of Scripture, and have never changed their standpoint?" -In addition to numerous members of the congregation and the students of the local seminary, about fifty pastors and professors participated in the celebration. Dr. Hönecke and President v. Rohr were present from the Wisconsin Synod, and Prof. Brandt from the Norwegian Synod, who at the same time, in the name and on behalf of the theological faculty of the Luther Seminary in Hamline, appointed the two jubilarians and also Professor Stöckhardt as Doctors of Theology honoris causa. From Prof. Brandt's speech we let follow the eulogy, in which he also commemorated the unforgettable Walther and thus justified the conferral of the doctorate on the three seniors of the local faculty:

"Omnes theologiae professores seminarii, quod dicitur Luther Seminar, discipuli fuimus magni theologi, beati D. Walther; omnes sumus alumni Collegii Concordiae; neque obliti sumus beneficiorum insignium, quae nobis et nostrae ecclesiae abhinc defluxerunt. Grato animo speciatim agnoscimus, quam optime de nostra ut de tota ecclesia Lutherana meriti sint tres professores seniores hujus collegii. Admiramur eorum eruditionem egregiam nec non genuinum fervorem atque habitum vere βεόσδοτον, quem tum in juventute theologica instituenda tum omnino in veritate divina docenda et defendenda ore calamoque exhibuerunt." - God bless our Synod and our sister Synods with all their teachers and servants, especially also the orthodox teaching institutions for the equipping of faithful laborers in his vineyard.

F. B.

The **free conference in Milwaukee,** September 9-11, was attended by more than 700 persons. Exactly 500 entered their names in a book published for that purpose. Of these, 377 belong to the Synodal Conference, 13 to the Norwegian Synod, 64 to the Ohio Synod, 16 to the Iowa Synod, 6 to the United Norwegian Synod, 3 to the Buffalo Synod, 3 to the Michigan Synod, 1 to the United Danish Synod, 1 to the Pennsylvania Synod, 1 to the New York Ministry, 1 to the English Synod of the Northwest, 3 to the Pacific Synod, and 3 to the General Synod. According to the reports, which this time did not differ much from each other, the questions were mainly: 1. What is the relation of the general will of God to the election of grace? 2. Must the passages of Scripture which deal ex professo with the election of grace (e. g. Eph. 1, 1-6. 2 Thess. 2, 13. Apost. 13, 48.) be interpreted according to John 3, 16. and similar passages of general grace? The answer of the Ohioans in Milwaukee is thus summed up by Dr. Stellhorn in the *Lutheran Standard*: "Rev. H. A. Allwardt . . . intended to prove, and in our opinion clearly did prove, 'that the universal counsel of salvation and the eternal counsel of election in the main are the same.'" "As a necessary introduction Dr. Allwardt had set forth that the explanation of Holy Writ should always take place according to the analogy of faith, so that difficult passages must never be understood in a sense that would not be in perfect harmony with the entirely clear passages that teach the fundamental truths of the Gospel." This agrees with the report of the "Lutheran Herald," according to which Dr. Allwardt also said, among other things, "Every doctrine must be proved from its own sedes doctrinae. But where difficulty arises in the interpretation, and harmony with the clear doctrines of Scripture cannot be established, such dark passages must be explained according to the light which the bright and clear passages throw upon them. The "Luth. Kirchenzeitung" of Columbus reports: "While on our side the principle was defended that all interpretation must be similar to faith, that no passage of Scripture must be so explained as to contradict the harmoniously interconnected summa of all clearly revealed doctrines of salvation, on the opposing side it was decidedly insisted that this principle was wrong, that a doctrine was to be drawn only from its actual tenets, from the clear, bright words dealing with that doctrine, and that such doctrine was to be held fast even if it appeared, namely, before reason, to contradict another doctrine." - The "Theologische Zeitblätter" also designate the Scriptural statements concerning the general will of God in grace as "the foundation and standard" according to which the passages concerning the election of grace are to be understood. (p. 261.) In the discussion of the first question concerning the relation of the general will of grace to the election of grace

the Ohioans proceed from the principle that the church and theology have the right and duty to rhyme the scriptural passages of the election of grace rationally and to bring them into harmony with the passages of common grace, and that it is not sufficient for the Synodal Conference to place the scriptural passages of the common will of grace and of the election of grace unmediatedly side by side, and to believe both. But this is a petitio principii. And in the examination of the second question, whether the passages of Scripture concerning election are to be interpreted according to John 3:16, the Ohioans presuppose that a passage of Scripture is obscure and must be interpreted according to other passages of Scripture, not only when its meaning cannot be grammatically ascertained in the context, but also when it does not seem to us to harmonize, e.g., with the passages concerning general grace. This too is a petitio principii. In both cases these are principles which overrule Scripture and, if upheld, make agreement between Ohio and the Synodical Conference impossible. - Resolved, by the Milwaukee Conference, that another free conference be held at Detroit, Mich. on the Wednesday after Easter, 1904. The subject of the proceedings there is to be the analogia fidei and the Scriptural proof of the doctrine of election by grace.
F.B.

How can unity be built among Lutherans in America? This is the question addressed in the September 11 *Lutheran Observer*. He begins by rightly emphasizing that it is not a matter of mere misunderstanding between the synods. He writes: "It is useless to say that we do not understand each other, and that if we could come together in general conference and get personally acquainted, we would find that we were being kept apart by misapprehension of each other's positions. There is no such misapprehension. We know perfectly well the positions of the different general bodies. Their views have been set forth time and again in formal statements. They have been embodied in synodical action, and defined in theological reviews in didactic and controversial articles. They are reiterated and emphasized week after week in the papers of the various bodies. It is precisely because we do understand each other that we are divided." This division, according to the *Observer, is due to the fact* that one does not recognize that the various Lutheran parties are only different species of the same genus "Lutheranism" and therefore refuse to recognize them as such. "Lutheranism" - says the *Observer* - "is a mere abstraction or generalization apart from the organizations bearing the Lutheran name." The General Synod, he says, takes the right position. It excludes no one from the community of faith in whom the generic of the Lutheran faith is found. It emphasizes the general in Lutheranism and allows each full freedom in the special doctrines. "It (General Synod) affirms and emphasizes what is universal in Lutheranism, and leaves the individual at liberty, within this generic unity, to receive and hold for himself whatever particularities of Lutheran statement may commend themselves to his acceptance. The only liberty denied him is that of forcing the particular upon his brethren who are content to rest in the full acceptance of what is universal in Lutheranism. It allows the same liberty in practice." The General Synod placed pulpit and communion fellowship, as well as combating the lodges, in the liberty of each individual congregation. The points on which the General Synod must insist are: 1. that the confession of the Augustana "as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word" is sufficient; 2. that all

3. that pulpit and communion with other Christian denominations be left free. In what the *Observer* sees the obstacle to unity, he says in these words: "It is a dogmatic and proscriptive temper that insists on acceptance of private interpretations and particularities of statement, and on absolute submission, in matters of practice, to a narrow and prescribed program. It is the spirit of determination to reduce generic Lutheranism to the type of some particularity. Even where all the symbols are accepted, it goes still further, and draws what are claimed to be 'inferences' from the confessions, and demands acquiescence in them equally with the confessions themselves." - To this we remark: I. Lutheranism is not a genus concept that must be abstracted from the Lutheran communities that exist in each case, but a quite definite quantity, present in the Lutheran symbols, according to which the communities that call themselves Lutheran are to be judged. 2. The General Synod does not fully profess this Lutheranism; therefore, it cannot be considered a legitimate "species" within the Lutheran Church. (The same is true of other communions which atrophy the Lutheranism of the Lutheran symbol in some way). (3) The Missouri Synod does not demand assent to mere conclusions, but expressly only to such doctrines as it has proved to be expressly taught, expressis verbis, in God's Word.

' F.B.

On what does the **future of the Lutheran Church in America depend?** To this question the *Lutheran Observer* thus answers: In our country a special American type of civilization will develop. There are social and religious problems which must be solved and in which the church will play a great role. The future in America therefore belongs to the church, which identifies itself most perfectly with the interests of society and the state and contributes most to the solution of the problems of our age and country. The Lutheran Church, he said, will be more glorious than ever if it succeeds in doing the work that circumstances demand. On the other hand, it faces a sad future if it fails to meet the needs of the times. The message of the Lutheran Church must be such that it meets the needs of the present, and that in the forms of thought and language of the day. The last phrase is strongly reminiscent of the language of the liberals, in whose mouth it would mean that all Christian doctrines, in order to make them fit for our time, must be brought under the aspect of evolution, which is in any case not the intention of the *Observer.* But it seems to us that the Observer does not realize that the greatest danger of the Church of our time is that it loses sight of its purpose and begins to engage in allotria, for example, by spending its time solving social and political problems instead of preaching the truthful Gospel and thus making people blessed. This misunderstanding of the purpose of the church leads at the same time to another danger, namely, that the church adapts itself to the circumstances in such a way that it adapts its teachings to them, instead of judging and shaping the circumstances according to the holy Scriptures. The inevitable result is then the corruption and secularization of the church, instead of the salvation of poor sinners from the world through the church. F. B.

A New Confession of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. In the *Lutheran World of* October I, it is pointed out by Dr. Remensnyder that it is time to exhibit a theory of the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures. On Luther's

In the early days, no one disputed the divine origin of the Holy Scriptures, which is why no article on inspiration was included in the confession. Now the Bible is contested from all sides, and therefore a confession of inspiration and a theory of it is a need of the church, not only of the Lutheran church, but of all churches in America. "All eyes in America are turned to the Lutheran church for leadership in this vital battle for the defense of the Scriptures, and a true, defensible, and workable theory of their inspiration." With this, he said, Dr. Jacobs of the General Council also agreed, writing in the *Lutheran Church Review* for October, "The time has come when, in antagonism to such criticism, the church must offer a restatement of its doctrine of the holy Scriptures. . . . The Augsburg Confession contains no statement on this topic; not because it was deemed unimportant, but because it was assumed, as its numerous appeals to Scriptural testimony as decisive show." The writer in the *World* therefore continues: "Let now Drs. Jacobs, Ort, and Singmaster call together the heads of our Lutheran theological seminaries, and let them give us a definite expression of the Lutheran view of inspiration. Let this statement be made confessional by its adoption by all of our general bodies. It is also our grand opportunity. Such action will be expected. It will not only make Lutheran history, but It will make universal church history." What the writer means by the theory of inspiration he briefly suggests thus: "A theory is simply such a statement of your views as harmonizes it with the necessary laws of thought, *i. e.*, proves that it can be rationally held." - We remark on this: 1. the church has no profession to expound rational theories of inspiration, but to profess all that Scripture teaches of inspiration; 2. Scripture clearly teaches that every word of sacred Scripture is inspired by the Holy Spirit, and therefore inerrant truth, and to this the Lutheran symbols already profess, though not in a special article. F. B.

Unionism in the Generalronril. The "Lutheran Church Gazette" of September 19 writes: "The Missourian magazine 'Doctrine and Wehre' carried the following notice in its September number: 'The *Lutheran of* June 25 reports that Dr. Harper, of the University of Chicago, delivered an address to the baccalaureate students at Augustana College on "The Higher Life and Religion". Dr. Harper is one of the higher critics, and can speak nothing but perversities about religion. Does the *Lutheran* approve of this ecclesiastical communion in the Conciliar even with a liberal?' To this the *Lutheran*, in its last number of September 10, gives the following curious answer: 'It is needless to say that the *Lutheran* has no love for Dr. Harper and his school, but thinks that the less he has to say to our Lutheran young people about important matters of faith, the better. It is quite likely, however, that on that occasion Dr. Harper was especially anxious to keep his erroneous teachings to himself, knowing full well that that kind of teaching would meet with little approval in Rock Island. He is too diplomatic to challenge the opposition of the Swedish Lutherans, and in this way to turn the tide of inclination away from Chicago University among the Scandinavian youth who have the ambition to take post-graduate courses. We could only heartily wish that all our Lutheran youth would stay away from the rationalistic atmosphere of Chicago University, and that all our colleges would encourage as much as possible such staying away.' If this answer justifies, or even excuses to some extent, the faculty of Augustana College in inviting Dr. Harper

it has completely missed its purpose. By inviting Dr. Harper, the Faculty has incurred a twofold guilt: it has extended its hand to a man who denies the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and it has exposed the youth entrusted to it to the danger of suffering shipwreck in their faith through this man's speech. In doing so, she has caused grave annoyance, and it would have been the duty of the *Lutheran to have explained* this in as many words as possible. clearly and unequivocally. - In the same issue, the *Lutheran* publishes a letter from Portorico about the inauguration of a Lutheran Church in Catano near San Juan. Among other things, it is mentioned that at this dedication in the evening, Rev. Dr. Drees, Superintendent of the Methodist Church there, held a most excellent sermon (he preaches like a Lutheran). It would have been the duty of the *Lutheran to* point out that ecclesiastical fellowship between Lutherans and Methodists, wherever maintained, involves a denial of the truth. " F. B.

Universalism among Baptists. In the Baptist *Commonwealth* writes Dr. P. L. Henson: "In our day the devil no longer throws Christians to the lions and burns them at the stake, but puts them to sleep, so that they say, 'It is peace,' while destruction threatens them. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that universalism is creeping into our pews and pulpits. We have come to think that men who still believe the old gospel are pernicious disturbers of the public peace. God help us to wake up and rightly realize the ghastly fact that men must believe the gospel or be eternally lost, and that their blood will be on our souls if we do not give them the gospel." - Every false doctrine has a tendency to deprive men of their faith and blessedness. This is especially true of Universalism. If the doctrine of damnation disappears from the pulpit, there will be no terror of hell in the sinner, and therefore no fleeing to Christ, who came to banish the terrors of hell. F. B.

Intolerance of the Reformed Churches. The intention of the Protestants in Switzerland and France to erect a monument to Servetus as atonement leads the *Presbyterian* of Philadelphia, among others, to the following remarks: Formerly, he says, they were too intolerant; now they are extremely indifferent. The world owes civil and religious liberty to Calvin. In Calvinist countries, free institutions and free churches would have found the fullest recognition. If Servetus was wronged, it was not the fault of Protestantism (the Reformed Church), but of the intolerant "age". If one wanted to erect monuments of atonement, then the Roman and Anglican churches and the descendants of the Puritan fathers in America would also have to be called upon to do so, etc. - That not only the Reformed in Switzerland, but also Papists, Episcopalians, Puritans and Presbyterians have sinned against tolerance is certainly correct. But it is wrong when the *Presbyterian* wants to make us believe that religious persecution is exclusively to be put on the account of earlier "ages. The persecution of dissenters is, on the contrary, a clearly distinct part of papist and reformed doctrine. Papists and reformists principally mix state and church, which consequently must always and everywhere lead to religious intolerance. If false doctrine is stamped a state crime, the persecution of false teachers is a state duty. From the mixture of state

But the Presbyterians, of all people, have not yet broken away from the church and the church. From the very article in which the *Presbyterian* calls Calvin the be

It is evident from the fact that the Presbyterian, who boasts of being the founder of religious liberty, is unable to distinguish between the reprehensible tolerance of false teachers in the church and the equally reprehensible intolerance of the same in the state. In their Westminster Confession the Presbyterians have changed many things in recent years. But still in it are found, for example, the words: "Magistratui civili ... incumbit providere, ut ecclesiae unitas ac tranquillitas conservetur, ut veritas Dei pura et integra custodiatur, ut supprimantur blasphemiae omnes, haeresesque etc." (Cap. 23, § 3.) Of all the Presbyterians and Presbyterian revisers, none seem even to have felt that these words were inconsistent with religious toleration and American liberty. The burning of Servet, as in general the persecution of heretics among Papists and Reformed, does not come to stand both on account of the "century," and rather on the doctrine of Rome and Calvin. In this piece, too, papists and enthusiasts are one cake. From this it is explained why the sectarian papers took so little offence at the intolerant omissions of Leo XIII. They could not touch this point without pronouncing judgment on themselves at the same time. F. B.

What Harvard offers theology students, says Dr. Moore, professor of theology at Harvard University, in the September 17 *Independent.*

He writes: In former times it was held that the Bible was inspired, infallible, and authoritative. The main task of theology had therefore been to determine philologically what the meaning of the Holy Scriptures was. But we have now gone beyond that. The goal of theological study is now a comprehensive understanding of the history of the Jewish and Christian religions. The Old and New Testaments were to be considered only as sources of history. They were to be supplemented by the sources of the four centuries before Christ. The method of research was philological and critical. Less emphasis is placed at Harvard on the knowledge of Hebrew. Christian dogmas were treated only as historical problems, "without apologetic or controversial animus". One seeks to determine the factors that led to the development of Christianity in the Middle Ages and during the Reformation. Special emphasis is placed on the history of theology after Kant, which is just as important for us as that of the first three centuries. The old dogmatics, with its doctrines of the Trinity, the person of Christ, creation, reconciliation, etc., together with the philosophy from which it was built, is considered obsolete at Harvard. These views of the old dogmatics could no longer be united with what the modern sciences revealed to us about the universe. What we have left of Christianity is not the dogmas, but the facts. "The facts of Christian experience and religious history remain; the Christ of the Gospels remains; and these facts are no less intelligible or significant in our way of thinking than they were to the Greek Fathers in theirs. The task of the constructive theologian to-day is to put in the place of the old dogmatics and apologetics a philosophy of the Christian religion in which the facts of Scripture, history, and Christian experience are interpreted in conformity with modem conceptions of the universe and God's relation to it, and of the nature and destiny of man. To this central discipline philosophy, psychology, the philosophy and history of religion are subsidiary." In the practical disciplines, Harvard endeavors to show students how they can use the results of their own research.

of modern theology for preaching and for the solution of economic, ethical and other questions of life. - At Harvard, modern rationalism prevails, as represented by Harnack in Berlin, Baumgarten in Kiel, Weinel in Bonn, and Rade in the "Christliche Welt." F. B.

Dr. J. K. Cheyne, the editor of the radical Encyclopaedia Biblica, will be by Dr. Abbott, the editor of the Liberal *Outlook:* "Dr. J. K. Cheyne is a scholar, highly gifted, an interesting writer, and a stimulating thinker, but less a scientific investigator of problems and impartial judge of reasons than an inventor of new theories. It is positively strange how incapable he is of subjecting a new theory to impartial investigation. We doubt whether he ever sees more than one side of any question. He makes leaps of reasoning with a mental agility that is bewildering; at times he hits the truth, at times he misses it, and the one dims his luck as little as the other. Every researcher must acquaint himself with his work, but it will not occur to any one to think his results on any subject conclusive. This is also true of his Encyclopaedia. It is interesting and stimulating, it contains many stimulating articles and few boring ones, but no one would think that it had definitively concluded on any subject." This is the opinion even of the liberal Abbott. Other papers, too, which are otherwise not averse to higher criticism, warn against "Cheynism." F. B.

What an ungodly fellow the "Independent" of New York is, is especially evident in its number of October 1. In earlier issues it had repeatedly mocked the promise of obedience in the marriage form. This earned him letters from various quarters pointing out the clear words of Scripture which make it the duty of a woman to obey her husband. But how does the Independent answer? He writes: "But these rectors all agree in telling us further that the promise should be required, made and kept because the Bible commanded wives to obey their husbands. That may be true, but what of it? We remember, for we have often read and heard it quoted, that St. Paul said to the Colossian and Ephesian women, 'Wives, submit yourselves to your husbands, as it is fit in the Lord.' We remember that he said to Timothy, 'Let the woman learn in silence, with all subjection,' and that he told the Corinthians that 'the head of the woman is the man.' But again we say, What of it?" "But our correspondents point us to the reasons Paul gives for the command that wives shall submit themselves to their husbands. It is because 'Adam was first formed and then Eve,' and Eve was first 'in the transgression.' That reason was good enough for Paul and Timothy and his Ephesians, but it is not good enough for us. Allowing that Adam was formed first, does that make him the better product? We read somewhere that Auld Nature first tried her 'prentice han' on man, and then she made the lasses. But the rectors tell us that 'Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.' Doubtless Paul believed that story of the fall of man to be good literal history, and so he used the argument, which, even so, is not conclusive, seeing that Adam's or Eve's credulity or sin does not control ours. But we do not now generally take that story of the creation and fall of man as literal history; we take it for a useful, religious, poetic legend, a sort of parable which we do not interpret on all fours. We cannot use it as closely and minutely as Paul could in his day. The argument is not good for us."

"We honor both Paul and the Bible best by frankly and plainly telling the truth as our day must see it." - This is what the Congregationalist *Independent* calls

He honors Paul and the Bible when he tells them to their face that their words are not lost on him. To the word of Christ, "It is written," Dr. Ward opposes his, "That may be true, but what of it?"! F. B.

II. Abroad.

The union of the German Lutheran regional churches was a major issue at this year's conferences and synods in Germany. In Bavaria, the planned church union was welcomed unconditionally by some synods, but by the majority of synods only under the condition that the confessional status and independence of the Lutheran synods be preserved. At several synods, it was also felt necessary to emphasize that the chairmanship and leadership of the Church Federation would not be assigned by right to the Oberkirchenrath in Berlin. The Munich Synod expressed its joy at the success of the Eisenach Church Conference and its hope "that it will now be possible to bring this matter to a legal conclusion. The Nuremberg Synod thanked the Oberconsistorium for its participation in the efforts to unite the Protestant regional churches, and expressed its confidence "that it will succeed in removing the last obstacles still standing in the way of the work. The "E. K. Z." reports on the position taken in Mecklenburg on this question: "The negotiations on the closer union of the Lutheran regional churches have caused lively concern in many Lutheran congregations. Since in Mecklenburg the committees of the church conference of both Grand Duchies have been asked to express these concerns, the committee's board has turned to His Royal Highness the Grand Duke as well as to the Consistory with the request that, whatever the proposals of the Eisenach church conference may be, the free right of approval or rejection with respect to all questions of organization of each state church be preserved for the future, and that any possibility of agreement by majority vote be rejected. In the meantime, the following answer has been received from the Grand Ducal Mecklenburg Consistory at Neustrelitz: The members of the committee of the ecclesiastical conference in Mecklenburg-Strelitz are, according to the highest command, given the answer to the Jmmediateingabe, that His Royal Highness the Grand Duke will not accept the petition. Highness the Grand Duke has gladly accepted the petition and has informed them that no agreements that question the Lutheran confession or the independence of our regional church will find the approval of Serenissimi or of the local church government. 1. that the leadership of the Federation of Churches will be permanently transferred to Berlin and thus come under unilateral influence; 2. that the Federation of Churches will arrogate to itself a dominion over the individual regional churches and thus abolish their independence; 3. that the Federation will adopt regulations by which the Lutheran confession will be violated. - That the union of the Lutheran regional churches for common church work already involves as such a violation of the Lutheran confession, no one seems to feel any more, even in Mecklenburg. Incidentally, there is no longer any regional church in Germany in which the Lutheran confession would really come into its own and unionism would not have been tolerated long ago.

F. B.

Religious compulsion in Pomerania. In Pomerania, Lutherans who move there from Mecklenburg are forced to pay taxes to the Unirte Landeskirche. They are not counted among the Old Lutherans (Breslauers), to whom they may wish to join, until they have effected their resignation from the Pomeranian Regional Church, to which they never belonged, in all forms of law. In Stolp a legal action has now been brought in this matter. A Lutheran who moved from Mecklenburg demands freedom from the church taxes of the local Landeskirch congregation and recognition of his affiliation with the Old Lutheran congregation in Stolp. The court decided: "To take evidence as to whether there is community of faith between the Lutheran regional church in Mecklenburg and the united Lutheran regional church in Prussia or whether both are considered different religious parties in the sense of § 261II tit. II of the Prussian General Land Law, by requesting the theological faculties in Greifswald and Rostock to provide official information. A second appointment is to be scheduled after receipt of the information." The state church congregation bases its claim on §§ 260 and 261 of the Prussian General Land Law. § 260 reads, "Whoever has knocked out his ordinary residence within a parish shall be parochialized to the parochial church of the district." § 261: "But no one shall be required at a parochial church by a religious party other than that to which he himself professes to pay burdens or dues flowing from the parochial connection, even if he resides in the parish." On this the "Kirchenblatt für die evangelischlutherifchen Gemeinden in Preußen" rightly remarks: "While one should think that this very paragraph (261), which after all is evidently intended to protect against taxation by a foreign church, quite clearly pronounces freedom from church taxes to the Protestant State Church for that man who acknowledgedly professes not the united Protestant State Church of Prussia, but the old Lutheran Church of Prussia as his religious party, the united congregation, by a quite peculiar interpretation, concludes just the opposite. It is not the individual's subjective allegiance to a church that is important, but whether the church to which he had belonged before his recent resettlement in Prussia is to be regarded as the same religious party as that of the Protestant State Church, or, in other words, whether there is a religious affinity between his former church and the Protestant State Church of Prussia. Hence the legal question, on which the theological opinion of a university faculty (the Greifswald faculty) and a Lutheran faculty is now to be sought. Up to now, the Prussian courts have assumed that the question of the existence of a religious affinity is not subject to judicial decision. (Cf. Goßner, Kirchenrecht, p. 213, note.) The Imperial Court, however, is of a different opinion." "Gotthold" remarks: "We fear that the decision of both theological faculties will be, 'Pomerania is a Lutheran province within the Union.'" In any case, the University of Greifswald will make the statement that there is, however, communion of faith between Pomerania and Mecklenburg. The plaintiff in Stolp will then have no choice but to resign from the Pomeranian Provincial Church, to which he has never belonged. F. B.

The "Evangelical Lutheran Conference within the Prussian Regional Church," which met in Berlin on September 9 and 10, decided to submit the following motion to the Prussian General Synod: "Reverend General Synod, in view of the great danger from which the Lutheran Church is being threatened by the present exercise of unrestricted doctrinal freedom, contrary to the existing doctrinal constitution.

In order to prevent the danger of negative theology threatening the teaching commitment, we ask the church government to look this danger sharply in the eye and to take the following measures as a means of defense until it is completely eliminated: First, a thorough examination of the position of every teacher of theology to be appointed with regard to the truth of salvation expressed in Holy Scripture and the confessions of the church. Second, participation of the General Synodal Board in filling theological professorships. Third, increase the number of seminaries for preachers under the leadership of capable directors who are faithful to the confession, as a counterweight against the confusing and corrosive teaching of negative theology. Fourth, the provision of means so that academically outstanding, capable positive theologians will be given more opportunity than before to take up and carry out the academic profession." - What comes out of such petitions, Kiel is the latest example. F. B.

Dr. Lepsius and the Community People. The "Old Faith" writes: "The rift that has been going through the German community movement for some time has now become a public fact. The leaders of the right wing, K. H. Rappard, O. Stockmayer, G. von Viebahn and E. Lohmann, have addressed a determined rejection to Dr. Lepsius in the -Wart/, to which the latter opposes an equally cool denunciation of the old friendship in his -Reich Christ/. The occasion of the whole is the strange effort of Dr. Lepsius to overcome Old Testament literary criticism by incisive textual criticism." The following statement was made against Lepsius in the "Warte", the newspaper of the community people: "The undersigned feel compelled to bear the following testimony: 1. We stand by the divine inspiration and authority of all God-given writings of the Old and New Testaments: 'Search ye now in the book of the Lord, and read; there shall be no lack of any one of them: neither shall this be missed, nor that. For it is he that giveth by my mouth; and it is his Spirit that gathereth it together, Isa. 34:16, 2. Although we are grateful to the Lord for every work that actually serves to establish the original text of the Bible by comparing manuscripts, we reject every scientific attempt in this area, by which the divine reputation of any part of the God-given Scriptures of the Old or New Testament is weakened or undermined, as an encroachment on the inviolable unity, on the organic unity of the entire revelation of Scripture; for: 'The holy men of God have spoken, impelled by the Holy Spirit', 2 Pet. We do not wish to take any other position towards the written word than that which Jesus Christ, our Lord, has taken, and accordingly express our conviction that in the Lord's church only those can be regarded as teachers and leaders who submit to the word of the Master: "The Scripture cannot be broken," John 10:35. 4. We gladly acknowledge the services which a faithful study of Scripture and sources, as the handmaid of the Lord, is able to render to the household of faith, but we most decidedly reject every attempt of science to set itself up as mistress, bowing worshipfully under the word of the Lord Jesus: 'I praise thee, Father and Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes,' Matth. 11, 25. K. H. Rappard. O. Stockmayer. G. von Viebahn. E. Lohmann." At the Alliance Conference of Community People inBlankenburg, Stockmayer said, "Lepsius saw in the quarrel between Cain and Abel a "love trade. In this, he said, he placed himself in opposition to Jesus, who speaks of the "righteous" Abel as the firstborn of the pious martyrs. According to Stockmayer he-

General Lieutenant von Viebahn took the floor and declared Lepsius to be an "impudent man who attacks the Holy Scriptures". Father Rubanowitsch, a proselyte from Judaism, declared that Lepsius had touched the Bible and should be expelled from the congregation. When hereupon Fr. Kamlah came forward to say a brief word in defense of Lepsius, he was turned away by the chairman. Others of the community people made it clear by word and deed (running away) that they did not agree with the verdict on Lepsius. And the Englishman Meyer urged indifferentist peace: one should put the main emphasis on the inner life in Christ and not confuse and bind the consciences by dogmatic quibbles. - Thus there can be no question of a unanimous confession of the inspiration and inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures, even among the community people. F. B.

The lack of influence of the Protestant regional churches. The "Alte Glaube" writes: "The elections have brought the painful chapter of the lack of influence of our Protestant regional churches before everyone's eyes. Full of bitter scorn, the ultramontane press exults: "German Protestantism no longer has any roots in the people, its end is near! But the conservative papers lament: "A Christian people would have voted differently! If the church had been a stronger power in the public consciousness, the wild flood would have broken against its walls! Complaining, however, is not enough, nor is caustic mockery. The disease must be recognized, the seat of the insidious evil must be determined. And here we must not pass by the fatal fissure which cuts through almost all the German national churches, the one more deeply, the other more superficially. They are no longer able to exercise authority, because they themselves no longer know any authority. Detached from the rule and guide of the divine word of revelation, they are unable to shepherd the people with the rod of infallible truth. Their light goes out because they themselves are no longer in God's light. Their chair wavers because it itself no longer rests on divine ground. First they sought to master God, in his law as in his gospel. Now one has himself become the prey of masterlessness. This is God's righteous judgment." - This judgment strikes the "old faith" itself, for it too belongs to those who no longer believe the old faith of the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptural word.

F. B.

A protest by Finnish people. The "Magdeb. Ztg." received the following appeal for publication: "Outraged at the violent measures which the Russian rulers are imposing on Finland, Finnish people who feel that their human rights have been violated hereby address the public opinion of the enlightened and liberal West in their own name as well as in the name of numerous compatriots. Four years ago the present autocrat of Russia broke the constitution which Alexander I. had confirmed at the conquest of Finland in 1809, and which the present Emperor himself, like all his predecessors, had pledged to uphold by solemn regent's pledge. Public opinion throughout the educated world expressed its displeasure at this breach of the Constitution in many ways. The arbitrary measures which made a mockery of all orderly administration of justice, and which the Emperor allowed himself to be induced to sanction by the imperious Governor General, were opposed by prudent but resolute resistance from Finnish citizens who held fast to the laws they had sworn to uphold. Irritated by this, the Russian Government has now introduced into Finland a reign of terror of which people living under legally ordered conditions can scarcely conceive. A people accustomed to obey the law

The Russian satrap, who has long successfully developed his national independence under the protection of liberal legislation, is now daily witness to a brutal rape of the law, while lies and slander are richly rewarded, and criminal individuals, when in the service of espionage, are withdrawn from the arm of justice. But not enough of this, the Russian satrap, to whose arbitrary power the monarch has now completely abandoned the Finnish people, has procured for himself the right, in a slanderous manner, to expel Finnish citizens from the country or to send them into the interior of the empire (e.g. to Siberia) and to detain them for a long time as he pleases. On the basis of this 'right' numerous expulsions from Finland have taken place in the last days of April. Some of the best sons of our country have been afflicted with one of the most severe punishments a man can suffer, banishment, a punishment which, by the way, is expressly forbidden in the Finnish penal code. None of our expelled compatriots has been informed of what he is charged with; as far as most of them are concerned, however, one can conclude that frivolous denunciations and personal vindictiveness caused the unbelievable act of violence. Crude representatives of the so-called authorities handed over the hectographed deportation decrees to those affected, on which the name of the 'convicted' was not even always listed. These henchmen of the governor-general have invaded private residences and business premises, they have broken into publishers' bookstores by force, they have destroyed goods and private property and, like vandals, have looted and pillaged. A long-nurtured desire to trample underfoot the fruits of Finnish cultural work now seems at last to have found its satisfaction and to be triumphantly making its triumphal march through our country. We have no hope that the destructive work of the perpetrators of violence could be hindered in its course by an objection on the part of the European press. We have wanted to inform that public opinion in the civilized world, which has sympathetically placed itself on our side, of the last and most violent manifestations of the regime which now seeks to destroy our national existence completely; we wished to address the representatives of civilization in the countries where we are known, in order to protest in the name of this civilization against the devastation of an area of occidental culture, against the fact that a state which has developed under the centuries-old protection of law and justice is being abandoned in the deepest peace to a formal state of war, that its members are being deprived of their work, their livelihood and their fatherland without any judicial process. Helsingfors, April 28, 1903. Finns of all estates." - Just now that the Czar has proclaimed religious freedom, the Russian government is directing heavy blows against Jews, Stundists and Lutherans. Is this plan or coincidence? F. B.

The Evangelical High Church Council in Vienna publishes the following figures on the Protestant movement in Austria for the first half of 1903. 1923 souls, including 825 men, 735 women and 363 children under the age of seven, converted from the Roman Church to the Protestant Church of the Augsburg Confession; 186 souls, including 64 men, 100 women and 22 children under the age of seven, converted to the Protestant Church of the Helvetic Confession. The total number of those who have converted is therefore 2109 souls. Those who left the Roman Church were 315 from the Lutheran Church of the Augsburg Confession and 150 from the Lutheran Church of the Helvetic Confession, a total of 465 souls. The two evangelical

The churches of Austria have thus gained a total of 1644 souls from the Roman Church. These numbers do not merely signify a standstill, but rather a sensitive decline in the movement. In individual superintendencies, the conversion to the Protestant churches is hardly more remarkable than it was before the cry, "Get rid of Rome!" was heard. Likewise, there is the peculiar phenomenon that Bohemia is receding into second place in order to give precedence to the Viennese superintendency. Here the movement is still throwing up lively waves, both as regards leaving and as regards resigning to the Roman Church. The total number of those who have left is 1011, that of those who have resigned 175. The backlash can surprise no one. It is given with the nature of every spiritual movement. On the other hand, the great mistakes made in the first fire of enthusiasm are now making themselves felt. Great buildings lie heavily on the shoulders of less efficient congregations. And likewise the internal constitution of the newly won Protestants leaves much to be desired. Some time ago the ultramontane side had the church-goers in the main districts inspected. If the figures that came to light here correspond to reality, we have before us a less than praiseworthy testimony to the ecclesiasticism of the young congregations.

(D. A. G.)

About the **unity of the Catholic Church**, the "Reform Catholic" Dr. **J.** Müller writes in the "Renaissance": "The Catholic is accustomed to thinking and feeling only in masses, to being commanded by an authority to which he submits without resistance, to which he prefers to subordinate his better knowledge and actions. He is proud of this unity, points with scorn to the disunity and multiformity of others, and does not feel what a testimony of poverty he is exhibiting to himself. Just look at how it is done in a Catholic assembly! There is usually no trace of debate; one declamers, the others applaud; dissent is shouted down. Such is the press, such is the party. In the case of differences it is scrupulously seen to that all debate takes place behind closed doors; outwardly the 'unity must be convulsively held fast; the differences are made to look like paste, opposition is hushed up, the minority must submit, and then the "Germania" triumphantly proclaims: "The hopes of the enemies for a division of the party were again in vain! The question of power is all-decisive, that only the Centrum can throw its hundred men unitedly into the fray and thus remain a factor with which the governments and the Curie must reckon! Whoever conforms to this discipline can go far, for loyal devotion finds its reward here. The Centre is also able to provide for its faithful; a glance at the appointments proves it. Knowledge, scientific, professional merit are not considered, only comradeship." "The basic evil of our canonical practice is the over-tension of the principle of authority. It has already come to such a pass that a judicial commission believes that it must convict someone who has been found innocent, because it has received orders to do so from the bishop. The chairman of that commission is even said to have shed tears that he had to exercise his sad office." - This is the disgrace of the Catholic, that he degrades himself to a servant of man, yes, to a mere tool and riding-horse of the priest, and in absolutely all things makes a sacrifice of his own thinking and judgment to the priest. F. B.

Of the Methodist Association in England, the Apologist writes: "There are seven different Methodist denominations in England. The great chief denomination is, of course, the "Wesleyan Methodist Church," with over 2200 preachers and nearly 500,000 members. The next in numerical strength is the "Primitive Methodist Church,' with 1085 preachers and 198,393 members.

The third strongest denomination is the United Methodist Free Churches with 448 preachers and 93,525 members. The two next in numerical strength are quite equal: the Methodist New Connection, with about 200 preachers and 42,000 members, and the Bible Christians, with 247 preachers and about 32,000 members. The two remaining divisions are the Independent Methodist Churches, with 397 preachers and 8377 members, and the Wesleyan Reform Union, with 18 preachers and 7821 members. - The sentiment in favor of union among some of these divisions has for some time been greatly on the increase. The Wesleyan Church, the most respectable denomination and the mother of them all, has hitherto taken a negative or wait-and-see attitude. Hugh Price Hughes, though a strong advocate of Union, and of the decided opinion that the Wesleyan Church should take the initiative in the matter, was of the opinion, when the subject came up at the last Ecumenical Methodist Conference in London (1901), that the matter was not quite ripe, and should not be forced. It would come of itself at the proper hour. In recent times, however, it has made considerable progress outside the Wesleyan Church. The union of all Methodist bodies in Australia, which was announced with great enthusiasm at the above-mentioned Ecumenical Conference, has had a tremendous moral effect, and at least four Methodist bodies in England seem to be no longer far from the goal of organic fusion. They are: (1) the 'Methodist New Connection,' (2) offer 'United Methodist Free Churches,' (3) the 'Bible Christians,' and (4) the 'Wesleyan Reform Union.' At the recent conference of the Methodist New Connection, the report of the Joint Committee, which consists of representatives of the four communities mentioned, was adopted with great unanimity, and will now be submitted to the individual congregations for a vote. The Committee expresses the hope that the steps already taken will prove to be the preliminary stages of a still wider movement, and may lead to a future organic union of all the divisions of Methodism as one great united Methodist Church'.The basis of the union on the part of the above-mentioned four denominations consists in the following four conditions: 1. Equal representation of preachers and laity; 2. The maintenance of the principle of communal union by the recognition of the authority of the Conference; 3. The due recognition of the position of the supervising preachers (Superintendent Ministers) in the transaction of all church business; 4. The retention of the so-called 'legal' or 'guardian' representative members. - The Committee had at the same time addressed a letter to the Annual Conference of Primitive Methodists, inviting them to join this Union movement. The Conference declined this before hand, but not from any want of sympathy with the cause itself, but only because they believed they would be in a better position to consider the Union propositions when the Union sought by the four named denominations would be consummated."

Church attendance in London. Attempts to ascertain the church attendance in London numerically were made in 1851 by the Government, in 1886 by the *British Weekly*, and in this year by the *Daily News*. These last statistics are said to give a fairly correct picture of the average church attendance of the London population. It was a laborious and protracted undertaking. No less than 2600 buildings were visited. Six hundred people were employed for more than half a year in counting the church-goers and arranging them according to sex. It was found that of the more than five million inhabitants.

London's only 850,205 churchgoers: One in five. Of these, 430, 153, or a little more than half, adhere to the Anglican State Church. The State Church is most strongly represented in the aristocratic West End. The middle classes in the suburbs adhere to the Nonconformists: Baptists, Congregationalists, Wesleyans, and Presbyterians. Only the fourth part of the church-goers falls to the other numerous minor sects. The Unitarians count 3599 churchgoers, the Quakers 2271, and the Herrnhuters only 100. In the Free Churches the male churchgoers are much more numerous than in the State Churches. The reason for this is that the State Churches are far more secular than the Free Churches, that the pompous ceremonial of the State Church attracts more the women than the men, and that the pastors at the State Churches are as a rule bad preachers.

F. B.

The position of the Russian Church towards Catholics and Protestants. The "Holy Synod" has commented in a letter on the suggestion of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The document, signed by the Metropolitans of Petersburg, Moscow, and Vladikavkaz, as well as by several bishops, deserves attention in several directions. First of all, it declares the readiness to exchange views on important religious questions, and points out the blessing which such a debate must produce. Then the letter moves on to the relations of the Orthodox Church with the other confessions, especially with Catholics and Protestants. The Synod (it is stated) regrets and does not tire of praying that these "sheep which have been torn away from the holy apostolic Church may repent and return to it". One wants to do everything to achieve this goal. However, the letter continues, it is not so much a matter of softening the relations between Orthodoxy and Catholicism, or Protestantism, as of "warding off incessant attacks and various calumnies" emanating from there. The eyes of Rome have long been directed at the Russian Church. But since it does not succeed in turning away the pious and devout Russian people, they try to persuade the members of the higher social classes, who live much abroad, to apostatize from the faith of their fathers. And this, unfortunately, succeeds only too often. The "conversion of Russia and the Russian people is an undisguised goal of the present papacy. However peaceful the speeches of the Roman clergy may be, one must not lose sight of its actual goals. The same is true of Protestantism. It looks upon Orthodoxy as upon an area of ecclesiastical stagnation, darkness, and superstition. He spared no effort to gain acceptance for his teachings among the members of orthodoxy. Religious fanaticism, one-sidedness, and disregard for orthodoxy were more strongly developed among Protestants than among Catholics. This was the result of the centuries-old prejudices and the narrow circle of Protestant leaders and theologians. For the time being, therefore, the Russian Church must direct its concern to "warding off this dangerous enemy of the Church". In the eyes of the "Holy Synod", on the other hand, the Anglican Church has found grace. There (so says the letter) one does not seek to turn away the Orthodox sheep. On the contrary, they often show the respect they have for the apostolic church. There is also the desire for unification. This desire, however, should not be limited to the higher circles, but should also be spread among the people. There is therefore still much to be done there. The letter also gives a relatively friendly opinion of the Old Catholics, whose unification with Orthodoxy it desires. The Synod is not particularly in favor of the calendar reform.

friendly. He does not speak against it, but one can read between the lines that in his opinion the change of the calendar does not correspond to the interests of the Orthodox Church. Finally, the hope is expressed that the Nestorians, Armenians, etc., who are closest to the Orthodox Church, will return to it; this should be worked towards above all. The spirit of the intolerant Chief Procureur Pobyedonossev comes out clearly enough in the extensive letter.

The baptism of Jews in Russia is made more difficult. In Russia, Jews are permitted unhindered residence only in the former Polish provinces. From all other parts of the empire, as soon as they make a nuisance of themselves, they can be deported at any time by the police to the community to which they belong. In order to escape this pressure, some Jews are baptized, whereby they become full subjects. Now the Ministry of the Interior of the Roman, Lutheran, and Reformed Churches in Russia has prescribed that every Jew who lives outside the settlement area and registers for baptism be required to produce a police certificate stating that he is permitted to reside in the place in question. The Russian Synod has also instructed the entire Greek Orthodox clergy to baptize Jews only after they have presented the police certificate of residence. - In the future, therefore, the police will decide whether a Jew may be baptized in Russia or not. F. B.

The sixth Zionist Congress, which met in Basle from August 23 to 28, meant a defeat for Zionism as a whole, which, as is well known, wants to establish an independent Israelite empire in Palestine. Dr. Herzl, the first chairman, had just arrived from Petersburg, where he had obtained an audience with the Minister of the Interior, in order to appease the disfavor of the government which Zionism had been feeling for some time. The Minister of Plehwe declared that his government had been favorable to Zionism so long as it had contemplated the emigration of a portion of the Jewish subjects from Russia and the organization of an independent Jewish state in Palestine. Even now he assures the support of the Government for the reduction of its Jewish subjects. But if the Zionists, instead of pursuing this aim, continue to unite the Jews within Russia into a national association, certain measures will have to be taken against them instead of the toleration they have hitherto enjoyed. It was further learned that a settlement of the north of the Sinai Peninsula, nearer the Wadiel Arish, the Biblical "brook of Egypt," was contemplated by the Zionist leadership. The English-Egyptian government had not been averse to the idea, but in February and March had a commission examine the land, which came to the conclusion that the lack of water there was too great for the planned agricultural settlement. Friendly members of the British government then proposed an area in East Africa in which the Jews would be given the opportunity to establish their state, naturally under British sovereignty. It was now necessary to make up one's mind whether one wished to go further with this proposal, which could only be a provisional arrangement, since one did not wish to deviate from the ultimate aim of the movement, which was to settle in Palestine itself and to found the Jewish state of the future. It was evidently very important to Dr. Herzl to win the assembly over to a closer examination of this project. Some speakers, such as Dr. Trietsch (Berlin), did not want to go into the matter at all. When finally, by 295 votes to 177, a commission was appointed for closer examination, the excitement was appalling. About

150 delegates protested vehemently and left the hall shouting and wailing. - The "Old Faith" notes chiliastically: "Mines and sobs are said to have gone through the hall when the decision was made in favor of East Africa. And certainly we Christians also feel the heavy blow. The hope that the Jews will soon reunite on holy ground is buried for the time being. Ahasver takes up his staff and wanders to Africa." The hope that the Jews will reunite on holy ground is not a Christian hope, but a Jewish delusion, to which the proverb applies: "Hoping and waiting makes fools of many .

"**Luther was a three-dimensional man.**" With these words the Union theologian Lepsius characterized the Reformer at the meeting of the regional church and Gemeinschastsleute in Eisenach. In his lecture "The Cross of Christ," which was also published separately, Lepsius says: "Let us not forget, however, that through the four centuries of the Protestant Church one man has not ceased to work, in whom head and heart were in the most wonderful balance, Martin Luther. All the lines in the history of our church and theology, the knowledge and mind that were able to unite head and heart to one truth, lead back to Luther. He remains the type for what we need at all times. What distinguished him from men of head and heart, who lose their balance soon to this side, soon to that? In what did his ability to keep head and heart together lie? Luther was a three-dimensional man. If knowledge draws lines to connect the near and the far with one another, if feeling creates a broad resonating surface that lets the note of the head resonate again in all the moods of the mind, all the sensations of the heart, - the whole man is only the one who puts the possession of the mind and the heart into practice. Luther was neither a one-sided man of understanding nor a one-sided man of feeling; he was a man of action who struck the spark of action out of the flint of the heart with the steel of understanding. Only the compulsion to action, which his conscience created for him, awakened in him the clarity of understanding bright enough to illuminate a world; only the hardship of battle awakened in him the strong heartbeat powerful enough to win the hearts of mankind and to accomplish the deed that has led to the greatest change in history in the entire Christian era. It was not until the second half of the last century that we were led back to this spiritual condition of the three-dimensional, the whole man, which Luther characterizes. A whole German man, three-dimensional in his spiritual construction like Luther, was only Bismarck again. He turned us Germans from a nation of thinkers and dreamers, of people who speculate and rave, into a nation of doers, a nation of soldiers, a nation of workers from all walks of life." - What made Luther great and a man of action was his unshakable certainty that he had before him the infallible Word of God in the Holy Scriptures, and the great conscientiousness with which he lived and believed according to it, things that have long since been lost to modern theologians.

F. B.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 49. November 1903. No. 11.

Use and abuse of the analogy of faith.

At the free conference held in Milwaukee in September of this year, the negotiations also turned to the "analogy of faith. It had been decided in Watertown that at the next conference all scriptural passages dealing with eternal election would be discussed. When this task was undertaken in Milwaukee, the question soon arose whether the scriptural passages dealing with election were to be taken as they read, or were to be "interpreted" or restricted according to the analogy of faith. One side (members of the Synodal Conference) held that the doctrine of election was to be taken from the passages of Scripture which deal with this doctrine (i.e. the **sedes doctrinae**). So, too, in particular, the relation of faith to eternal election is to be determined only from those passages of Scripture which reveal this relation to us. The clear scriptural statements about a doctrine are to be held fast even if we cannot recognize the rational connection of this doctrine with other revealed doctrines, or if this doctrine seems to our reason to contradict other revealed doctrines. As an example was given the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, where the complete undivided and indivisible unity of the essence seems to contradict the trinity or real diversity of the persons. On the other hand, it was emphasized that the scriptural statements about the individual doctrines must be interpreted, or rather limited, according to the "analogy of faith. Thus it came to be further discussed what the analogy of faith is. From our side, namely from the members of the Synodal Conference, it was stated that the "analogy of faith" was not something subjective, not the insight into the rational connection of the individual Christian doctrines, but something objective, namely the clear statements of Scripture themselves, which we put together and let stand side by side, even if we should not be able to follow them.

The first part of the book is the book of the first author. Therefore, clear statements of Scripture were never to be dismissed or reinterpreted under the pretense that they contradicted other clear statements of Scripture. The ancient theologians, therefore, not only defined the analogy of faith thus: "By the rule of faith we understand the clear passages of Scripture in which the articles of faith are presented in clear and explicit words," 1) but also added: "the rule of faith is to be accepted in its entirety, and the individual parts of it are not to be opposed to one another." 2) The opposing position, so far as it was expressed in Milwaukee, we do not wish to describe in detail for the present. The "Church Bulletin" of the Iowa Synod reports the following: "Dr. Allwardt was commissioned by the Ohio Synod to deliver a paper for this meeting. He was to present the passages of Scripture dealing with the election of grace exegetically, that is, expository. But before he proceeded to that in his work, he set forth more fully the principles of interpretation which guided him. Here he came to a very important subject, namely, the analogy of faith, that is, the similarity or congruity of the Christian faith, Rom. 12:6. There was a very lively argument about this during the first days. Father Allwardt represented the "ecclesiastical" (?) "side of the right relationship of the Christian doctrines of faith among and to each other. The people from the Synodal Conferences, with Missouri in the lead, represent an "unbiblical" (?) "and unhistorical" (?) "analogy of faith. Father Allwardt emphasized that "all Christian doctrines of faith must be in harmony, that is, in agreement" (according to the judgment of faith or according to the judgment of human reason?). "The Scriptures must not be so explained that the individual doctrines come into conflict with bright and clear passages of Scripture. That this" (what?) "is right, however, was denied by the representatives of the Synodal Conference. And before they even came to the discussion of the doctrine of the election of grace, a fundamental discord had already arisen within the participants in the assembly. In the same way, it was only natural that, when it came to the doctrine of election by grace, and also to conversion, in so far as it was touched upon, it should be revealed anew how great was the gulf which must be bridged, if a real and true agreement is to be reached in this matter. Here the representatives of the Synodal Conference reiterated and asserted the whole of the old position. They said that the proper analogy of the faith was that the individual doctrines of the faith should be raised and proved from the passages of Scripture alone, which were the seat of the doctrine. But the interpretation of such passages had nothing to do with inquiring whether and how such doctrines were related to other Scriptural teachings.

1) Thus Gerhard, "Loci," L. de interpretatione Sc. s., § 75.
2) Gerhard, l. c., § 154.

teachings" (according to the judgment of blind human reason) "harmoniously unite, whether and how they stand in the right relationship to each other. Decades ago the Missouri Synod spoke quite differently, as can be proved by its own testimonies." To the writer of the foregoing report, the point at issue has remained obscure. 1) The negotiations on the **analogia fidei** did not come to a conclusion. The assembly agreed to take up this subject again at the next meeting, in order then to discuss all the passages of Scripture which deal with eternal election.

1) Subsequently we see that the "Theol. Zeitblätter" of the Ohio Synod also deal in more detail with the position we took in Milwaukee. Unfortunately, this report also overlooks the very point that was at issue in Milwaukee. It was not a question at Milwaukee, and from the very beginning of the controversy, whether the Christian doctrine and all the articles of it form a perfect unity, an intimately connected, harmonious whole, in the sense of the sacred Scriptures, which cannot contradict each other; but it was and is a question whether the Christian doctrine and all the articles of it form a unity, a system, in the sense of human reason. As to the former, it was said in "Lehre und Wehre" 1881, p. 6: "There is no doubt that there is a necessary inner connection between all the individual doctrines of faith. As in the one God there is the most perfect harmony without any contradiction, so certainly also the revelation of God in Scripture is perfectly harmonious, inwardly most closely and necessarily connected. This close inner connection is already evident from the fact that the violation of one article of faith has a dissolving and destructive effect on the others. Here belong Luther's sayings in which he compares revealed truths to a golden chain, a ring, a bell, or a mathematical point." What was and is in question is this, whether the articles of Christian doctrine form a system in the sense of human reason, so that, if anything does not fit into the framework of reason's coherence, the theologian would be justified in reinterpreting clear statements of Scripture or denying them altogether. That even the old Lutheran theologians conceived of the harmonious unity of Christian doctrine only as a unity in the sense of the divine revelation of sacred Scripture, not in the sense of human reason, we proved in Milwaukee from the fact that the old theologians said in one way or another: "partes analogiae fidei sibi invicem non *opponendas* esse," one must not *oppose* the individual parts of the analogy of faith to one another, and: "judicium de contradictione in articulis fidei non esse permittendum *rationi humanae*," one must not leave to human reason the judgment as to whether there is a contradiction between the individual articles of faith. If the "Theological Gazettes" of the Ohio Synod now bring 12 quotations from old Lutheran theologians on the analogy of faith in general, but do not cite a single quotation in which these same theologians say that the individual parts of the analogy of faith are not to be opposed to one another, that the judgment of harmony in Christian doctrine is not to be left to human reason, then this is an incomplete and therefore incorrect and misleading representation.

In several accounts of the Milwaukee Conference we find the remark that a new difference has come to light in the dissent over the use of the analogy of faith. This is an erroneous assumption. From the very beginning of the last doctrinal controversy, the difference in the conception and application of the analogy of faith has been pointed out. And not merely in passing, but at great length. Schreiber, for example, in the preface to his "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Wehre) of 1881, that is, almost 23 years ago now, dealt at length with the fact that the two sides' doctrinal position was based on a different position with respect to Scripture. It was explained that on the part of the opposing side such a view and use of the analogy of faith was coming to light, whereby Scripture no longer remained the only source and norm of theology, but the subjective view of the theologian was taking the place of Scripture. We will take the liberty of returning to these remarks later.

There is a right and a wrong use of the analogy of faith in interpreting Scripture. Rightly used, it serves to keep human thoughts out of theology. At all times there have been people who have inserted their own thoughts into certain passages of Scripture that are difficult to interpret; for example, in certain passages of the Revelation of St. John they have found an outwardly glorious kingdom of Christ taught here on earth, and from this they have argued against the clear passages of Scripture. These human thoughts were rightly rejected by appealing to the analogy of faith, that is, to the absolutely clear statements of Scripture. There have also been people at all times who have concluded from Jac. 2:21 ("Was not Abraham justified by works?"), from the injunctions of Scripture to believe, to obtain salvation with fear and trembling, to refrain from resisting, etc., that conversion, justification, and salvation do not depend solely on God's grace, but also on the works, good conduct, etc. of man. To these people the analogy of faith has been justly opposed, saying, "You interpret the Scriptures contrary to the clear Gospel." As Luther remarks on Rom. 12:6 ("If any man have prophecy, let it be like faith"), "Hereby is mightily rejected all doctrine and interpretation of Scripture, which lead us to our works, and make false Christians and worksaints under the name of faith." (Erl. ed. 8, 23.)

But then there is also a wrong use of the analogy of faith. One has, as church history teaches, invoked the analogy of faith to reject clear teachings of Scripture under a good pretense. One has confused one's ego with the analogy of faith. Certain doctrines, revealed as clear as day in Scripture.

they did not want to believe, did not want to give their reason captive to the obedience of Christ. But instead of openly confessing this to themselves and to others, they came forward with the assertion that the doctrines in question were in contradiction with Scripture, or with the analogy of faith.

We will give only a few examples in which, according to all Lutherans, there is a wrong use of the analogy of faith. The Scripture says that the Son of God was born of the Virgin Mary. Gal. 4:4: "And when the time was fulfilled, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman." The Scripture further says that the Son of God was crucified. 1 Cor. 2:8: "If they had known (the wisdom of God), they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." Nevertheless Nestorius most decidedly denied that Mary was to be called **Στόχος** (God-bearer), and that suffering and death were to be pronounced of the Son of God. And for this denial he appealed to the analogy of faith, and to such passages of Scripture as say that God is unchangeable, life itself, and therefore cannot die. To speak of a birth of God, as well as to say that God died, was "heathenish" and "contrary to Scripture." 1) That the analogy of faith is here used to reject the clear teaching of Scripture is obvious. The same game was repeated with Zwingli. Zwingli also denied that the Son of God died, on the ground that according to Scripture God could not die. In the interest of analogy of faith, or to bring Scripture into harmony with Scripture, Zwingli allowed himself a little correction in the passages of Scripture which say of the Son of God suffering and dying. One must always substitute "human nature" for the "Son of God". Then everything would be correct. Then the Scriptures would be interpreted "according to faith." This is Zwingli's **ἀλλοίωσις.** For this quite wonderful figure of speech he demands acceptance by virtue of the analogy of faith. He treats Luther like a schoolboy, and accuses him of the "greatest heresies," because Luther would not also thus interpret the Scriptures according to the analogy of faith. Let us hear Zwingli at some length. Zwingli says: "Since Christ speaks Luc. 24: 'Did not Christ thus have to suffer? and thus enter into his glory?' Here Christ alone is taken for the human nature, which might suffer and die, but the divine not." In reference to John 1:14, "The Word became flesh," Zwingli, in the name of the analogy of faith, demands that the matter be reversed, and that it be said, "The flesh became Word." He writes: "Joh. 1: -The Word became man' or 'God became man' is to be rightly understood by the counterchange (**alloiosis**) thus: Since God may become nothing at all, or else He would be imperfect, this Word may not be

1) In Thomasius, "Dogmengeschichte," I, p. 321 ff.

according to the first appearance, 1) but must have the sense: Man became God; so that that which is said of the Godhead, that it became man, must by substitution be understood of mankind: Man has become God." After Zwingli has thus turned the hindmost first, and turned the matter upside down, he gives Luther the following extra lesson on the interpretation of Scripture, specifically on the use of the analogy of faith to interpret the individual passages of Scripture: "Seest thou, dear Luther, how the most utter words, concerning the eternal Deity and true humanity of Christ, must be "sent through figures and tropos into the right sense, which is inviolable to faith" (that is, does not contradict the analogy of faith)? Why then wilt thou not allow tropos or figurative discourses? . . . Pious Christian, let not such frolics (of Luther) seduce thee. They are word-fighters, whose nobility is very easily broken, if one looks to the ground of truth and to the right sense and keeps the art of figurative speeches and tropes well. As here, I think, are more noble words: 'The Word became man,' neither, 'Eat, this is my corpse^; nor so they must be understood by figurative explanation alone, or else we would get into the greatest heresies that ever were." 2) That Zwingli here misuses the "analogy of faith" to pervert and deny clear statements of Scripture is probably universally conceded.

The same abuse of the analogy of faith is found throughout the Reformed theologians when they deny the essential presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper and Christ's presence on earth even according to his human nature, and assert on the contrary that only bread and wine were included in the Lord's Supper and that Christ was included in heaven according to his human nature. The latter is required by Scripture when it says that Christ's body is a true human body, and that Christ has ascended into heaven according to his human nature. If one does not want to bring Scripture into contradiction with itself and thus go against the analogy of faith, one must interpret the Scriptural statements concerning the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper differently. Luther forcefully explains how gross an abuse of the correct sentence, "Scripture cannot be at odds with itself," there is here. Luther shows that the enthusiasts confuse their own ego with the analogy of faith, that they interpret Scripture not according to the analogy of faith, but according to the analogy of unbelief.

Luther writes: "They speak: The Scripture contends against itself, and no man can bear it" (that is, harmoni-

1) That is, as the words go.

2) Zwingli's answer to Luther's writing: "That these words" etc.. Reprinted in Luther's Works, St. L. ed. XX, 1195 ff.

siren), "where it is not believed that there is bad bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. Answer: What scripture? They say, "Yea, where the article of faith is founded, that Christ is gone up to heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God in his glory. Item, that the eating of flesh is of no profit, Joh. 6, 63: "Flesh is of no profit, if there were flesh and blood in the Lord's Supper, he could not sit at the right hand of God in his glory, and give us also to eat, which is of no profit unto salvation. Therefore one scripture" (any scripture) "must be made wise, and Christ's body must be made a sign of the body; this must be the text in the Lord's Supper..... Hold them now one against the other, the enthusiasts and the scripture-mongers. Carlstadt brought this forth; that would not stand. Then came Zwingel, and wanted to make it better with his interpretation; that is even worse. After that Oekolampad comes with his body's sign, as with the very best piece; and passes the very worst. For this is his reason: I Oecolampad say that the Scriptures in this piece are contrary to each other. Now is not this a tender and delicate reason of faith, when a man thus saith, Though the word of God stand, saying: But because I cannot understand it, nor believe it, and think it to be contrary to the Scriptures, it is not true, and must have another interpretation, no matter how bright the Word of God may be. This is the spirit of Oecolampad, and a truth of great renown, that the ignorance and unbelief of men should prevail over the word of God, and establish our faith. Who could not do the same in all the other articles? So deep shall Satan deceive such men. Now this reason of Oecolampad's is overthrown with one word, that is, No, these Scriptures are not contrary to each other; it may be said and thought so, but it cannot be proved. So then all his boast lies in the mire. Will you now have scripture from us, dear enthusiasts? There it is: "Take, eat, this is my body. Bite your fill of her this time, and afterward you shall have more. O how sure ye were, and thought not that this saying should ever be reproached or reproached against you! For ye had not crucified him alone, but had also buried him, and laid guards round about the sepulchre, so that he was no more valid. But now he rises from the dead, and will never die, and throws you, his enemies, under him, and makes you his footstool. This deceived the good man Oecolampad, that Scripture, being contrary to each other, must of course be reconciled, and one part take a mind that is at variance with the other; for this is certain, that Scripture may not be at variance with itself. But he did not perceive and consider that he was the man to pretend and prove such disagreement of Scripture; but he accepted it, and carried it forward as if it were certain, and shot it over. There he falls and lacks. But if they consider beforehand, and see how they will speak nothing, for

God's word, as St. Peter teaches, and left their own sayings and doings at home, so they did not do so much harm. This word, Scripture is not contrary to one another, would not have deceived Ecclesiastes, for it is founded in God's word that God does not deny, nor does his word deny: but the addition of his word (I Ecclesiastes say that the Scripture here is contrary to one another) brings him into such sweat and misery that he denies, turns back, interprets, and tortures God's word as he pleases. O Lord God, how easily is it done for such an abominable case; and we are yet safe, and fear not in such a slippery way. But I will better touch and report their right reason, which moves them to such error, and will bet on it for my life and soul (which I also do not like to lose), that I will not miss it; for I poor sinner also know a little of the spirit, and a large piece of the old mischief, which rages in us, I mean the flesh. That little bit moves them most, that it is foolish in the sight of reason to believe that we should eat and drink the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. And know, indeed, where they gain, that this should be the final rejoicing: Yes, I thought it would not be right; it never seemed to me that Christ's body and blood should be so acted upon. As they are now talking secretly among themselves, and the mad riffraff is evidently chattering. But they would gladly hide it, for they are ashamed to confess it; they know well that it is good for nothing, but they are glad to see that the mad mob goes out with it, and they do not speak or write against it. But it is shameful that there is not so much integrity and honesty in them as to freely confess such things as they desire in their hearts, and like to have, to see, and to hear; but they pretend that the Scriptures compel them, which they know to be untrue; but they attack the Scriptures with cunning and iniquity, to adorn themselves with them before men, and to bring their poison among men under the name of the Scriptures. But though they conceal these things with great diligence, yet the mischief cometh forth, and is remembered. Zwingel confesses so much that he has never believed it all his life. Now, from such a confession it is easy to notice that he did not have such conceit from the Scriptures, which he found long after, as his book **Subsidium in** particular, and others more prove; but long before, before he found such Scriptures, he believed so, and now runs first of all, seeks Scriptures and forces them on such conceit. Carlstadt also, before he wrote, long before, said to one, "My dear, you will not persuade me that God is in bread and wine. So they go out unawares, by God's power. The same Oecolampad, when he hath leaped over the Scripture that is set before him: help God, how lolling he is, how lecherous he is, how dancing in his conceit, and asking, Wherefore is it profitable? Why did not the disciples worship the bread? Why does not the Scripture say this is a miracle? What good does it do?

that Christ is invisible? Why should Christians believe such hard things? How can it be rhymed that the King of honour should let such wicked men play with him? ... Who shall not here take hold of what they think in their hearts? If they were moved by the Scriptures, they would leave off such jokes and deal with the Scriptures. It is the resentment and disgust of natural reason, which will not and does not like this article; therefore it spews and kicks against it, and then wants to wrap itself in the Scriptures, so that it should not be known." 1)

So far Luther. Lutherans will agree that in the way a Nestorius, Zwingli, Oekolampad, etc. want to use the analogy of faith in interpreting Scripture, there is an abuse of the analogy of faith. Lutherans should agree on the following propositions:

Clear passages of Scripture are not to be set against other clear passages of Scripture; that is, clear passages of Scripture are not to be dismissed or reinterpreted, because reason cannot see how they rhyme with other clear passages of Scripture.

If, however, this is done, that is, if clear statements of Scripture are rejected because reason cannot tell how they rhyme with other clear statements of Scripture, then Scripture is interpreted not by the analogy of faith, but by the analogy of unbelief, which does not submit to God's Word, but wants to master God's Word.

F. P.

(Conclusion follows.)

Recent Pentateuch Criticism.

(Continued.)

II.

On the history of criticism.

2.

Almost a century had passed since the attacks of the last-named precursors of higher criticism: Peyrere, Spinoza, Hobbes and Richard Simon. They had been sharply undertaken and thoroughly refuted by their contemporaries and by the faithful critics of the following period, on the Reformed side by the already mentioned Witsius, 2) but especially on the Lutheran side by the equally erudite and astute

1) St. L. ed. XX, 793-800.
2) "Miscellanea Sacra" I, 14: To Moses Auctor Pentateuchi.

J. G. Carpzov, 1) to whom even Cornill gives the testimony that he "takes the stand of the strictest Bible-belief against the '**pseudo-critici**' . . . manfully and with most respectable erudition". 2) Then, about the middle of the eighteenth century, the evil seed of the forerunners sprang up and brought forth the most disastrous fruit. The ground was now extremely skilful for this, for it was the time of rationalism in Germany, of deism in England, of naturalism in France, and the denial of divine revelation, of miracles and prophecies in Scripture became more and more the principle of the prevailing theology. It was at this time that the modern criticism of the Pentateuch really began, and it was first connected with the name of the French physician Astruc, whom both positive and negative critics of the present time call the real father of the present criticism of the Pentateuch. Strack says: "Systematic, scientific Pentateuch criticism was first practiced, and that through literary analysis, by Jean Astruc," 3) and Cornill, after calling the preceding period a "century of stagnation," remarks: "With the middle of the eighteenth century a new life comes again into the discipline" of Old Testament introduction; he then calls Astruc's explanations "ingenious investigations" and his book, published anonymously in 1753, "one of the most significant and momentous that has ever been written. 4) From this time on, Pentateuch criticism has worked restlessly for 150 years, putting forward a host of hypotheses about the origin of the five books of Moses, one of which has usually fought and overcome the other. For the sake of clarity, we will group the most important views and refer to them by the commonly used names of the older documentary hypothesis, the fragment hypothesis, the supplementary hypothesis, and the newer documentary hypothesis.

The older deed hypothesis.

The previous attackers of the Pentateuch were content, as we have seen, with denying the unity of the five books and their uniform composition by Moses. Astruc now went a great step further in his much-mentioned "Conjectures Concerning the Original Reports, of Which Moses Probably Made Use in the Compilation of the First of His Books," published in French and later translated. Already before him some had expressed the opinion that Moses used older writings or sources when writing the Genesis.

1) "Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti" and "Introductio ad libros Veteris Testamenti!". Both works are still very useful today - unfortunately little known and used.

2) "Introduction to the Old Testament." Second edition, p. 6.

3) "Introduction to the Old Testament." Fourth Edition, p. 29.

4) Introduction, p. 5. 6. 19.

Astruc, however, made the first attempt to separate these sources, to analyze them. It is precisely through this that he became the father of the basic theory of the newer Pentateuch criticism, the so-called literary or source analysis. He argues that Moses, whom he still considers to be the author or, more correctly, the compiler of the Pentateuch, did not report the things told in Genesis as an eyewitness and must therefore have had some older written sources. He did not actually process these, but rather compiled them without significant changes. In order to substantiate this, Astruc emphatically draws attention to a peculiar alternation of the names of God in Genesis, which, of course, had already been noticed and discussed by the church fathers Tertullian, Augustine, and Chrysostom: some narratives regularly had the name of God Elohim, others just as regularly the name of God Jehovah. Thus Astruc arrives at two main documents: an Elohim document A, to which he assigns quite definite chapters and verses of Genesis: Cap. 1. 2, 1-3. 5. 6, etc., and a Jehovah document B, to which likewise quite definite chapters and verses belong: Cap. 2, 4-24. 3. 4 etc. Here, then, we meet for the first time the famous great unknowns, the Elohist and the Jehovist, or, as is generally said at the present time, Jahvists, who have now played the great part in Old Testament criticism since Astruc's time. The Elohimurkunde was derived by Astruc from Moses' father Amram; about the author of the Jehovahkunde he dared no conjecture.

But Astruc went even further. Because of alleged repetitions and strange elements, he also assumed other, admittedly much less frequently used sources, which were to be recognized by other characteristics, in total still 10, so that his designations of them extended to the letter M; and he even knew that a part of these documents was not of Hebrew origin, but Moses had received them from tribal peoples during his stay in Midian or during the desert journey! Thus we get the result: Genesis is composed of twelve different sources and partly of pagan origin. 1)

1) It does not fall within the scope of this work to describe the higher critics according to their other views or according to their living conditions; but there may be room here for a few words about Astruc, of whom many at present judge similarly to Vilmar in his "Collegium biblicum" (I, 37): "The believing theologians, who usually curse Astruc, have mostly not read him. His thought is admittedly obscure, but a scoffer he was not." In the vernacular encyclopedias, Astruc is usually referred to only as the confulting physician of the French king and professor of medicine in Paris, whose chief medicinal work was entitled "De morbis venereis." But the American theologian, Prof. Dr. Howard Osgood, in a detailed study published in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* (1892, p. 83), has described Astruc in greater detail. The latter was in the Paris of his day, which was a second Sodom

Astruc's book, of course, did not receive a friendly reception at first. He was ridiculed, and the learned German Orientalist, J. D. Michaelis, the main authority on Old Testament questions at the time, condemned the work as soon as it appeared. Yes, Astruc's views would probably have been completely forgotten, at least temporarily, if the German rationalist critic Eichhorn had not soon joined them in his comprehensive "Introduction" in an independent way. Eichhorn still considered Moses, at least in the first editions of his then respected work, to be the author or, better, the compiler of the Pentateuch, but, like Astruc and with the same justification, he assumed two main documents for Genesis, the writings of the Elohist and Jahvist, in which, apart from the different names of God, a different use of language is also apparent; in addition, various interpolations had been made. With respect to the other books of the Pentateuch, he taught that their contents, not counting later additions, grew out of essays that were simultaneous with the Mosaic law, some of which were written by Moses himself, and some by some of his contemporaries. Ilgen followed in the footsteps of Astruc and Eichhorn with a work already characterized by its title: "Die Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt. The radical critic Cornill calls it an "ingenious book", but thinks that with it "Pentateuch criticism has gone through its flailing years: everywhere bursting with youthful vigor, which in the consciousness of its strength feels the urge to let off steam, but unfortunately through lack of moderation harms itself and arouses distrust against itself, and also through the in places somewhat rude tone often repulsive". 1) Ilgen's progress on the sloping path of criticism consisted in the fact that he divided the Elohimurkunde of Astruc and Eichhorn into two parts, a first or older Elohist, and Gomorra was, a prominent personality, according to the judgment of his contemporaries, a quite lewd, money-grubbing and ambitious man, who led a dissolute life and was the money-grubbing doctor of dissolute Parisian society until his death. In spite of his wife and children, he lived for nineteen years with the most notorious but influential maitresse of Paris, Madame de Tencin, and was an obedient servant to the royal mistress, Marquise de Pompadour. In the salon of his maitresse moved the well-known Parisian atheists and encyclopedists of the second half of the eighteenth century. From another immoral connection his maitresse was the mother of the free spirit D'Alembert. The latter calls his stepfather the "rogue Astruc." Voltaire gives him the epithet "Harpagon Astruc," and calls him "possessed by a devil." Though Astruc was very rich, yet, after the death of his maitresse, he appropriated all her fortune without giving a farthing to her family. And the purpose of his book, though he presented it as an apology of the Mosaic version of Genesis, was no other than to deny the supernatural in the Bible, to prove that Genesis never was and could not be the word of God, for it was not the work of an honest compiler.

1) Introduction, p. 19.

the "first Eliel," and a second, younger Elohist, the "second Eliel," an invention which all recent criticism has followed, as we shall see later. Moreover, he held fast to the Jahvist, whom he took the precaution of calling at once the "first Elijah," for it is "possible that he will not remain the only one in the future, and that another Elijah will yet appear," 1) with which prediction Ilgen was not mistaken. Thus we now find three main sources already accepted by criticism, in the analysis of which, however, Ilgen proceeded so foolishly and intemperately that he cut up the whole of Genesis into 17 documents. Ten of these he attached to his first Elohist, five to the second, and two to the Jahvist. Therefore Genesis had not "one author, but only one compiler, one arranger, one collector. 1) And this collector had made the documents of the first Elohist the basis of his collection, and had therefore supplied them most completely of all. The documents of the second Elohist and of the Jahvist have "come down to our times only mutilated". 1) With this work of Jlgen's, which appeared in 1798, the time of the document hypothesis now closes for the time being, and the fragment hypothesis takes its place.

The fragment hypothesis.

The transition from the documentary hypothesis to the fragmentary hypothesis was quite natural. All respect for the word of God had disappeared; to bow under the authority of Scripture and its Old and New Testament statements was a position overcome; reason reigned unchallenged in this age of vulgar rationalism. If Ilgen had maintained that his 17 documents were, as he put it, "really documents existing by themselves and not parts torn out of the context of a larger work," 1) it was now no great step further to dissolve the whole into a collection of little or no connected fragments. This step was taken by the rationalist exegete Vater in his commentary on the Pentateuch, published between 1802 and 1805, after Peyrere and Spinoza had already hinted in this direction and the English Catholic Geddes, in particular, had developed this idea further in a work on the Bible and in his "**Remarks on the Pentateuch**". Father translated and expanded Geddes' work and concluded his commentary with a "Treatise on Moses and the Authors of the Pentateuch. Whereas Astruc and Jlgen had limited themselves to Genesis, Vater now took the entire Pentateuch under his critical knife. The result of his examination, in his own words, was this: "The books of the Pentateuch, all of them from the first to the last, break up into separate pieces, into large, smaller, even quite small pieces, of

1) Cited in Cornill, Introduction, p. 20.

which it cannot be shown that originally there was a connection between them. In the case of most of them, rather, the opposite is clearly visible. 1) Thus, for example, Father divided Genesis into 39 such incoherent fragments, some comprising several chapters, others only four to five verses. An unknown collector then strung the pieces together on a "loose thread of chronology," for he intended only "not to let any such fragment of ancient news be lost." 1) With such a bottomless view of the origin of the Pentateuch, the assumption that Moses was also only the collector - of an author there could no longer be any question at all -, in general the origin of the Pentateuch in the Mosaic age was more than doubtful, as Vater also openly stated and made the assertion that the existence of the present Pentateuch "only becomes completely reliable around the time of the exile". 1) For about 30 years this fragment hypothesis met with considerable acclaim and decided adherents. Among these, besides Hartmann, who completely shared Father's views, and v. Bohlen, especially De Wette is significant, one of the sharpest, clearest, but also most doubtful critics of the nineteenth century. 2) De Wette, who also emphasized the difference between Deuteronomy and the four preceding books and thus founded another modern critical view, later turned away from Father's views and did not come to a firm and conclusive opinion about the origin of the Pentateuch, but he attacked the Pentateuch from another side in the harshest way. Above all, he disputed the credibility of the historical content of the five books of Moses, described their narratives as myths and unauthenticated sagas embellished with miracles, and declared the whole work to be a poem worked out according to a certain plan, as "the epic of the Hebrew theocracy. But in this time of the now reawakening faith in the Bible, strong opposition arose against the rationalistic unbelief that otherwise flooded everything, and Ranke, Hävernick, and Hengstenberg, in particular, defended and proved by thorough investigations both the unity and the credibility and Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch. 3)

1) Cited in Cornill, Introduction, p. 21.

2) "Contributions to the Introduction to the Old Testament." "Textbook of Historical-Critical Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament."

3) F. H. Ranke (younger brother of the well-known historian), "Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch"; Hävernick, "Handbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Alte Testament"; Hengstenberg, "Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament". Volumes 2 and 3: The Authenticity of the Pentateuch: all solid works, of which Hengstenberg in particular is also used by opponents because of its richness, though not always mentioned.

De Wette's myth hypothesis and Father's fragment hypothesis could no longer be upheld, the latter also no longer scientifically by the liberal critics. For even the most home-baked reason had to realize that the fragment hypothesis, which made the whole Pentateuch a desolate chaos of incoherent pieces, was not the right one. Thus criticism sought new ways, and in place of the fragment hypothesis, which to our knowledge has not a single supporter at the present time, the so-called supplement hypothesis was introduced, which, of course, can only be described as a transitional stage to the newer documentary hypothesis.

The Supplemental Hypothesis.

The actual father of the supplementation hypothesis is the well-known outstanding Hebraist of the last century, Ewald, who, as a young man of barely twenty, dealt the death blow to the fragment hypothetical in the circles of the critics by his aggressive first work on "The Composition of Genesis". For, in contrast to Father's expositions, he proved a uniform, systematic composition in Genesis; he explained the alternation of the names of God by sensible and deliberate alternation of one and the same author, and designated the other peculiarities in the exposition, on which the critics had relied for their views, as peculiarities of Semitic historiography, and not as reasons and proofs for the diversity of documents. But Ewald soon changed this view, and his second opinion was: Not only Genesis, but the whole Pentateuch was woven together from an old scripture, which tells the history from the beginning of the world down to the death of Moses and calls God Elohim, and a later new scripture about the old history, which, however, took up antiquity from other sides, but in such a way that the old scripture was and remained the basis. The Elohim or basic scripture was completed in this way. 1) This hypothesis found its most thorough implementation and strongest advocacy notably in the Genesis Commentary of the rationalist exegete Tuch, published in 1838. Tuch asserted: We have everywhere only two authors, "of whom quite simply one expanded the writing of the other," the "basic writing" or the Elohist, and the "completer" or the Jahvist. The basic scripture was written by a priest

1) Ewald later developed this view even further and made it more and more complicated by assuming four writings underlying the Pentateuch, which admittedly still exist only in fragments, to which then successively by five narrators or supplements the remaining parts had been interwoven and worked into each other with the fragments - a hypothesis which because of the gradually happened elaboration of the Pentateuch has sometimes been called the crystallization hypothesis, but which actually comes closer to the newer documentary hypothesis.

written in Saul's time, for the complementarian "we stop at Solomon's time". 1) We see: Moses from now on, indeed, already from De Wette's time, does not even come into consideration as the author of a document, and disappears altogether from the history of the origin of the Pentateuch. This supplementary hypothesis also found for a time notable representatives, not only in De Wette in later years, further in the mediatorial theologians Stähelin and Bleek, but especially for a longer time in Franz Delitzsch in the first editions of his Commentary on Genesis. Delitzsch, who wanted to be counted among the positives and who believed in revelation, but who always feared that he might be considered unscientific and regressive, and who therefore allowed himself to be pushed into making more and more concessions to negative criticism, probably thought that he could hold on to his belief in the Old Testament's basic revelation with this hypothesis. But even this supplementary hypothesis, which was opposed by J. H. Kurtz in his "Unity of Genesis," survived and at present has only one representative, the old and sick, rationalistically oriented Schrader. In its place came the so-called newer Urkunden Hypothese, and thus we come to the latest times.

L. F.

(To be continued.)

Theological Dicta Classica.

(Found in Luther's works.)

De Scriptura Sacra.

(Continued.)

The silver thread that runs through all of Scripture is Christ.

(Dictum 17.)

17. "The Scripture will know of nothing else, nor set it before us, but Christ." (Ill, 1176.)

a. "Moses will bear witness to the Messiah, that is certain." (XX, 2628, § 189.)

b. "The prophet David showeth the right handhold whereunto all Scripture chiefly pointeth and showeth, namely, to the promised Christ." (V, 1471.)

c. "The principal thing must be true, that the old holy Scripture goeth and witnesseth unto Messiah and our faith; he that understandeth it not thither cannot have it." (St. L. ed. XX, 2106, § 188.)

1) Cited in Cornill, Introduction, p. 23.

d. "On the same prophet, who is Christ, all the books of Moses look." (111, 2246.)

e. "He that seeketh not Christ, or seeth in the Bible and Hebrew, seeth nothing, and speaketh as the blind man of paint." (XXI, 486.)

f. "The Scripture, thus testifying of Messia through and through." (IX, 1411.)

g. "That God became man is taught by this whole and certain book (the Bible), of which no other book knows nothing." (IX, 1412.)

h. "Apart from this book Christ is not found, be it ever so." (IX, 1365.)

i. "Verily, the whole Biblia hangs in this oath of God (Luc. 1, 55.); for it is all to do for Christ in the Biblia." (VII, 1312, § 136. **Anno** 1521.)

j. "In the Bible thou shalt find the swaddling clothes and the mangers wherein Christ lieth." (XXII, 86. VI, 1344. XIV, 4. St. L. ed.)

k. "And God is especially concerned about the revelation and knowledge of his Son through all the Scriptures, Old and New Testament; all things point to the Son. For the Scriptures were given for the sake of the Messiah, or the Seed of the Son." (111.2891, § 138. **Anno** 1543.)

l. "To him that hath the Son, the Scriptures are open; and the greater and greater his faith in Christ becomes, the brighter the Scriptures seem to him." (III, 2892, 8 139. **Anno** 1543.)

m. "Search diligently for the Lord Christ in the Old Testament, for he is readily found in it, especially in the Psalter and Esaias. (111.2900, § 150. **Anno** 1543.)

n. "The prophets have spoken of the time of the New Testament." (VI, 3094.)

o. "And what is the New Testament but a public preaching and proclamation of Christ, set forth by the sayings in the Old Testament, and fulfilled by Christ." (XIV, 2. **Anno** 1523.)

18. "Holy Scripture is the book, given by God to the Holy Spirit of His Church." (XVII, 150, § 45. **Anno**

1542.)

Nota. The church has no word of its own. She trusts in what God has spoken, Rom. 3, 2. And what God has spoken, God's word, she teaches and confesses.

a. "Neither is it proper for the Church to change the order of the Holy Spirit, nor does it ever do so." (XVI, 2641. From the writing "Von Conciliis und Kirchen." A very extensive, but a very careful, prudent, and dispassionate polemical writing - in which one can really look into the heart of our Luther. It dates from the year 1539; read it, young theologian).

b. "Let nothing in Christian doctrine be believed, nor supposed to be certain, that is not written in sacred Scripture." (XIX, 705.) "Nothing need be done for the service of God without a certain word of God." (XIX, 575.)

c. "Let nothing be accepted or begun in the Christian church contrary to or without God's word." (II, 2588.)

d. "Yea, they say, the Christian church and holy fathers have so ordained, therefore we are obedient; so again God will say, Yea, where is my word? where have I commanded it to be so ordained?" (Ill, 249, § 17.)

e. "Noah did not take one step out of the ark without God's word." (Ill, 249, § 19.)

f. "Nor will we be wiser and more than God, that we do all things according to our own conceit, and think not once upon God's word." (Ibid.)

g. "But I contend but for two things. The first, I will not suffer men to set new articles of faith, and to reproach, blaspheme, and judge all other Christians throughout the world for heretics, apostates, unbelievers, only that they are not under the pope. It is enough that we let the pope be pope; it is not necessary that for his sake God and his saints on earth should be blasphemed. The rest, all that the pope sets, makes, and does, I will receive, judging first according to the holy scriptures. He shall abide with me under Christ, and be judged by the holy Scriptures." (XVIII, 1256.)

19. "The divine word is the right pestle and probir stone." (VII, 1785.)

20. "The word is the right touchstone." (VIII, 768, 8 175.)

21. "Without the Word we are to know nothing and see nothing." (II, 1178.)

22. "He that despiseth one word of God esteemeth not any great thing." (XX, 1119.)

23. "No letter of Scripture is in vain." (X, 1229.

Anno 1538.)

24. "To the sacred Scripture let nothing be added, neither let anything be taken from it." (Ill, 2461.)

Nota. Dr. Walther remarks: "He who will not acknowledge the whole of God's word is already rid of the whole of God's word." In the holy Scriptures the truth is infallibly and wholly laid down.

25. "Whatsoever is not with the Scriptures is contrary to the Scriptures." (XIX, 1342.)

Nota. Hear some of Luther's conclusions, "But what is contrary to God, that the devil does." (XIX, 1342, § 68.)

"All men's thoughts without God's word are vain lies and false dreams." (XIV, 88, § 13. **Anno** 1529.)

26. "That which has no ground in Scripture is as easily despised as proved." (XIX, 705. **Anno** 1523.)

27. "Why is the scripture not believed? Because one saying is more valid than all the books of the world." (XIX, 2162. **Anno** 1523.)

Nota. "So it is to me that every sentence makes the world too narrow for me." (XX, 982. **Anno** 1527.)

"We invent nothing new, but hold and abide by the old word of God." (XVII, 1659. **Anno** 1541.)

28. "Who would believe that which had no testimony from Scripture?" (I, 498.)

29. "Holy Scripture alone is the right liege and master over all Scripture and doctrine on earth." (XV, 1758. **Anno** 1521.)

30. "The word of God is the sanctuary above all sanctuaries." (X, 56, § 38.)

31. "Only see that thou take heed to God's word, and abide therein, as a child in the cradle." (St. L. ed. XX, 747, § 34. **Anno** 1526.)

32. "Let Scripture alone remain the judge and master among all books." (I, 1939, § 236.)

Nota. Dr. Walther says, "Scripture is the Alpha and Omega of all beatific truth. From Scripture no appeal can be made to a higher court." (Tenth Report of the Synodal Conf., p. 49.)

"We are to give captive reason and all prudence in God's works and words . . . and be blinded, led, and mastered, lest we become God's judges in his words." (St. L. ed. XX, 1028, § 339. "Conf. of Christ's Supper." **Annov** 1528.)

"**Spiritus Sanctus in Scriptura et per Scripturam loquens est supremus judex." (Quenstedt, Theol. did. -pol., P. I. c. 4. s. 2. q.** 15.)

"We are to speak of God's works with His words, simple-mindedly, as He has prescribed and made us speak of them." (XX, 1028.)

Nota. "All straying in matters of Christian doctrine comes only from leaving aside the clear Word of God, and from not wanting to imitate what the Word of God says." (Twelfth Report of the Synodal Conf., p. 18.)

"As a young child saith unto his father the faith, or Our Father. For here it is to walk in darkness and blindly, and badly to cleave to and follow the Word." (St. L. ed. XX, 1028, § 340.)

"We shall certainly lack where we do not simple-mindedly repeat after Him (God) as He speaks before us." (XX, 1028, § 340.)

This is not easy, as Luther testifies: "Oh how with much great effort and labor, even through well-founded Holy Scripture, I have hardly been able to justify my own conscience, that I alone have been allowed to appear against the Pope.... . . Until so long that Christ has fortified me with his one certain word," etc. (XIX, 1305. **Anno** 1522.)

"God has set forth in the holy Scriptures the whole ABC of Christian doctrine. All that is required is the acceptance of what has been revealed, the recitation of what has been said, simple faith." (Twelfth Report of the Synodal Conf., p. 17.)

"We speak as God's Word speaks. We need only repeat in all doctrines what God so plainly sets before us." (1. 6., S. 18.)

(To be continued.)

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The General Council held its 29th meeting at the beginning of October in Norristown, Pa. The English Trinity congregation had made their church available to the Council. The Canadian "Kirchen-Blatt" of October 22 writes: "The choir here is a particularly uniformed small group of male and female singers, dressed in a kind of gown, to which the young girls also wear the well-known student hat, a kind of Uhlan cap with large tassels. With this uniformed choir at the head, the delegates of the 29th Assembly of the General Council, after confession in the Sunday school room, went to the church on Thursday morning for the opening of the deliberations by a service." Two synods were admitted: the English New York and New England Synods and the Nova Scotia Synod. In September 1902, 36 English pastors resigned from the New York Ministry and formed their own synod. With this Synod, therefore, the Conciliar received no actual increase. "It is different" - so reports the "Kirchen-Blatt" of the Canada-Synod of November 5 - "with the Synod of Nova Scotia, it is a sister of our Canada-Synod and, like us, is carrying on a missionary work to the descendants of the Germans of Nova Scotia under the protection of the British flag. This Synod was at first a conference of the Pittsburg Synod, but at the advice of her mother organized itself as an independent body in July, 1903, and now numbers 7 pastors with 23 congregations and 15 preaching places." - From the Iowa Synod, which had not sent a representative since 1888, Prof. W. Pröhl was present. Of the position of the Iowa Synod in relation to the General Convention, the "Lutheran Church Gazette" of Reading, in its number of October 17, writes: "The Iowa Synod was concerned in the establishment of the General Convention at Fort Wayne in 1867. Yes, Prof. G. Fritschel mar the German secretary of the Concil. The delegates from Iowa were especially active in the hymnal and liturgy question. But the Iowa Synod never joined the General Council. It took a 'waiting position' with the right of debate at the conventions. Professors G. Grossmann, Sig. Fritschel, Gottfr. Fritschel and P. J. Deindörfer were gladly seen.

as representatives of their synod at the conciliar assemblies. In particular, Prof. Sig. Fritschel almost always present until 1888. In the first Convention of the Concil at Fort Wayne (1860) the Iowa Synod made a submission and proposed: 'The General Assembly of the Church would also like to expressly confess what in their opinion is actually contained in the adopted doctrinal basis, namely: 1. That according to the confession of the Lutheran Church it must be rejected and is also rejected by the General Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America: All ecclesiastical fellowship with non-Lutherans, e.g. the serving of mixed congregations on the part of Lutheran pastors and the admission of such congregations or their preachers to Lutheran synods, the admission of other believers to the Lord's Supper of the Lutheran church and of non-Lutheran preachers to the pulpits of Lutheran congregations, etc. 2. That, according to the word of God, church discipline must be practiced, especially in the celebration of the sacraments, and that the same must also be exercised against the evil of secret societies. 3. that the decisions of the Synods in general, and of the General Assembly in particular, must not have a legislative, but only a consultative power for the congregations which are united in these Synods, since these bodies have only so much power as is delegated to them by the congregations/ At the 6th Convention of the Council (Akron, O., 1872) a petition was again made by the Iowa Synod to the Concil, saying, 'We cannot yet be satisfied with the declarations of the General Assembly of the Church concerning the Communion and Church Fellowship question, as the same were made at Lancaster, O.' Thereupon the Conciliar resolved: 'Only Lutheran pastors in Lutheran pulpits. Only Lutheran communicants at Lutheran altars.' At the 19th Convention in Chicago (1886) Professors Dr. Sig. and Dr. Gottfr. Fritschel were present, and 'the relation of the Iowa Synod to the Concil' was discussed. Voices had been raised by Pennsylvanian delegates (especially Dr. Seiß) against the waiting position of the Iowa Synod. The censure was somewhat strongly expressed. Professors Fritschel explained the resolutions of their Synod at Toledo, and asked 'to remain for now in the present relation to the Conciliar The Conciliar resolved:-Acknowledged, and that in the not distant future the Iowa Synod will come into full organic connection with the Conciliar.' In 1888 Prof. Dr. Sig. Fritschel appeared at the Concil for the last time as a representative of the Iowa Synod, and since then no delegate had come from Iowa. The Concil had reestablished a connection by sending a delegate to the Iowa Synod. Prof. W. Pröhl had now appeared, was welcomed and given the right to take part in the debates. Prof. Pröhl gave an inspiring speech." "On October 12, Rev. Dr. Berkemeier, as a delegate of the Conciliar to the Iowa Synod, reported the following: that he had attended their Synodal Assembly at Dixon, III. He had been welcomed by Praeses Dr. Deindörfer and greeted with applause by the Synod..... A letter was then read from Praeses Dr. Deindörfer to the President of the Council, informing him that in 1904 the Iowa Synod would celebrate the 50th anniversary of its founding. I know myself to be in unity of faith with you. The Synod has decided to invite a representative of the General Council. Let the President of the Council arrange to send a representative to the Jubilee Celebration to be held in Dubuque from August 24 to 30. The Concil resolved to accept this invitation and send a delegate." In his welcoming address, Prof. Pröhl said, "There has never been a time since the Conciliar began its mission in this country when the Iowa Synod did not have close

and cordial relations with the General Convention. I may recall the friendship which united the distinguished founders and fathers of the General Convention with the fathers and leaders of the Iowa Synod, now at rest in God. We are conscious, with thanksgiving to God, that these relations with the General Convention form a blessed part of our history. These relations have always been cordial. This was most beautifully demonstrated by Dr. Berkemeier's warm reception at the General Convention of the Iowa Synod in Dixon last year. There was a general desire to come closer again to the Concil. It was decided to send a delegate to this meeting. But more important than this is for me to testify that we know ourselves to be in full communion of faith and confession with the General Council, and that we see in the doctrinal position of the General Council the sound basis for the union of all faithful Lutherans in our country. We rejoice that our Lutheran Church has found in the General Council a faithful guardian and caretaker of its best traditions and tasks. Great things have already been accomplished for the healthy expansion of our Church; on its trajectory lies the future of our Church. It is the best representative nominis Lutherani; as conservative as it is progressive, as bound as it is free, it combines with fidelity to God's Word and the confessions of our Church an open eye and understanding for the tasks of the present, it seeks to preserve and increase the rich heritage of the Reformation, avoiding the false extremes to the right and to the left. At the present time a strong pull toward unification is going through the synods in the west of our country. But we fear they will continue to bring the liberty of the church under a foreign yoke, and to degrade the church of Luther into a school. In contrast to this, we see the striving for unification realized in the Conciliar, and behold here the banner around which all faithful Lutherans of our country can rally." ("Church Journal" of the Iowa Synod, p. 272.) What Prof. Pröhl here calls "bringing the liberty of the church under a foreign yoke," is the demand of the Synodal Conference that the Iowa Synod also bow to the clear word of Holy Scripture, not merely of conversion and election of grace, but also of church fellowship with dissenters. - The delegate of the General Synod, Dr. Bell, also delivered (as reported in the "Church Gazette" of Reading) a long speech, in which he declared the doctrinal differences to be imaginary. In order to maintain relations with the General Evangelical Lutheran Conference in Europe, a standing committee was appointed by the Concil. Dr. Späth was elected as the representative of the Concil for the meeting of this Conference in Nuremberg (1904). And it was decided to invite the General Conference to meet here in America in 1907. F. B.

"**How does the General Synod stand on the Confession?**" On this question the "Church Bulletin" of the Iowa Synod of October 31 writes: "Officially it professes the Augsburg Confession, and at its meeting at Des Moines, Iowa, in 1901, it declared that the attempt in the Confession to distinguish between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines was contrary to the position of the General Synod. Nevertheless, as the *Lutheran World* rightly points out, and as every knowledgeable person knows, there are not a few writers in General Synod who never tire of asserting in the papers of General Synod that the Augsburg Confession contains non-fundamental articles which no Lutheran need accept. And what is worse, they maintain that this is precisely the right position of the General Synod. That is why, for example, the *Observer*, probably the most respected paper in the General Synod in its time, regretted that the General Synod in

Des Moines has passed such a resolution, and asserts that it is contrary to the Constitution of General Synod. How, we ask, in view of such declarations, does General Synod stand by the Confession?" - The General Convention stands in church fellowship with the General Synod. Now, if the Iowa Synod maintains church fellowship with the Concil, it enters at the same time into church fellowship with the General Synod. F. B.

A bequest that could prove fatal. Dr. Stuckenberg has bequeathed $35,000 to Pennsylvania College of the General Synod at Gettysburg with the proviso that his wife may give this sum to Marietta College at Marietta, Ohio, if, in her judgment, Gettysburg College is less progressive than Marietta College ("if, in her judgment, Pennsylvania College is made to subserve dogmatism and traditionalism instead of a progressive, living Christianity"). On this the *Presbyterian of* November 4 remarks: "In an endeavor to secure this tempting legacy there is danger of too far a departure from a well-known and influential faith. A rivalry may spring up between the two institutions as to which best meets the conditions of the bequest. One may go farther than it would otherwise do in what liberals are disposed to call a 'progressive, living Christianity.'" - In its number of November 13, the *Lutheran Observer* seeks to justify Stuckenberg. It writes: "If Dr. Stuckenberg was not thoroughly true to the Lutheran system of doctrine, we never saw any indication of it in his multifarious writings. If he ever undervalued dogmas, as truths formulated from the Scriptures, we can recall no word of his to show it, either in conversation or print. That his acceptance of the Augsburg Confession was of the 'Faith embodied in the Confession' and not necessarily the ipsissima *verba*, is doubtless true, but in this he was in harmony with the great body of confessional Lutheran theologians of Germany. It is also true, doubtless, that in his acceptance of the Lutheran faith there was provision for enlarging its content by incorporating with it the increasing knowledge of the meaning and application of divine truth which God is vouchsafing to His Church through the ages. And this is the point where an issue has been raised in the Lutheran church that must be understood by those who criticize Dr. Stuckenberg's will. For it is maintained by some Lutherans that confessional statements are not subject to such enlargement of their content under advancing knowledge, nor dare there be the least modification of them without forfeiting the identity of the faith. Not only must those who set them forth agree to use the same words, but they must use these words in one and the same sense, and that sense is 'their own true, native, original and only sense'. It was against this interdict on any development of theology, the determination to confine it within the hard and fast lines of its original statement four centuries ago, that Dr. Stuckenberg protested while he lived, and apparently it was this he had in mind when he used the words 'dogmatism and traditionalism' in making his will." - According to this, Dr. Stuckenberg demanded the liberty of liberals to connect any meaning with the words of the Augustana. And with this the *Observer* declares itself in agreement! F. B.

"**Unconscious Christianity.**" This is how the *Lutheran Observer* describes the charity of people who do not profess Christianity. He writes: "Today no one will deny that much good is done in the world by men and women who do not profess to be Christians. The day is gone when such good actions were called 'brilliant vices'. . .

All these virtues (for virtues they are) and all these brilliant deeds have their source in the teachings of Jesus. The whole Christian world is so saturated with the principles of Christian doctrine that there is not a decent and honorable man who does not possess a great deal of what may justly be called -unconscious Christianity." - It would be bad for the *observer* if one had to judge his knowledge of the essence of Christianity according to this. Christianity is essentially not morality, let alone purely external morality. Benevolence, decency, and respectability are not in themselves unmistakable marks of faith. The justitia civilis is also found among pagans and open enemies of Christianity. According to the *Observer,* Carnegie, for example, who performs many "brilliant works" but openly rejects Christianity and the Bible, would be a Christian without knowing it himself. The Church must maintain the distinction between truly Christian works and the works of humanity and civil respectability. Truly good works exist only where there is faith in the heart from which alone they spring. If, therefore, a man rejects Christianity, it is clear that from his works of respectability and humanity we must not infer latent Christianity hidden in himself. F. B.

The "Evang. Zeitschrift" of the Albrecht people raises serious accusations **against the Methodist Episcopalians.** For years unbelief had been eating away at the Methodist Church and infecting many of its theological professors and preachers. Two of its most prominent institutions are specially mentioned, Northwestern University at Evanston, III, north of Chicago, and Boston University. The following is taught to prospective Methodist preachers: Many parts of the Scriptures are spurious and should be removed from the canon; there is nothing wrong with inspiration; creation is a myth; there have been no miracles at all, nor did the Lord Jesus perform any miracles. Dr. Thomas, who was expelled years ago for denying the doctrine of reconciliation, and afterwards gathered a large free congregation in Chicago, reported to Methodist Bishop Merrill in Chicago, that a number of Methodist Episcopal preachers were living in and around Chicago, who, like himself, did not believe in the doctrine of reconciliation. Bishop Merrill, however, took no notice of this, nor did the administrators of the said seminaries, the annual conferences, or the General Conference, take any notice of the complaints which had been made against the professors who were giving the negative criticism to the prospective ministers. - Dr. Munhall refers to the prevalence of unbelief and worldliness as the reason why many Methodist congregations have not gained but lost members in recent years.

F. B.

The "Christhood of Christ." The Methodist "Apologist," September 16, writes: "The Christianity which our Lord Jesus Christ taught and represented by His example was not a Christianity of the letter or of outward forms and ceremonies, but of holiness, sympathy, love, and self-sacrifice. These are the things which have the highest value in God's sight." - These sentences the liberal theologians would subscribe to without hesitation. The things which the "apologist" mentions are certainly fruits of Christianity, but they do not designate the essence of it. Essentially, a man's Christianity is nothing other than the confidence that God has accepted him, the sinner, to grace for Christ's sake. And this Christ did not represent by his example. Christ does not belong to Christianity.

merely as a model, but as a redeemer, not as the first fruit and most beautiful flower, but as the ground and root of the same. F. B.

The **General Conference of the Evangelical Fellowship** held its meeting in Berlin, Ont. in early October. The Premier of Ontario, J. W. Ross, welcomed the assembly. There were 100 delegates present. In their report the bishops emphasized that within the Evangelical Fellowship the authenticity and inerrancy of Scripture was not disputed. They lamented, however, that here and there the worldly life with its sinful pleasures was encroaching. Also, the growth of the congregations has not met expectations. (The Evangelical Fellowship at present numbers 123,776 members and has seen an increase of 6163 members in four years). There is no complaint about the generosity of the members. About $700,000 have been received for missions (in America, Europe and Japan) in the past four years. The establishment of English congregations in the larger cities should no longer be postponed if one does not want to lose the youth. There is a great lack of capable workers, which can only be remedied by more generous support of the educational institutions. The church order requires that every preacher teach catechetical instruction in every congregation for at least six months of the year, but no "law of the church" is violated more often than this. The Youth League was well organized and about a quarter as large as the number of church members. It is to be deplored, however, that its members dispense with the church services. The Protestant community advocates complete abstinence; it is therefore reprehensible when (as often happens) members of their church visit saloons or rent out their property for saloon purposes. - One of the main subjects of discussion was the question of whether lay representation should be introduced into the annual conferences and into the General Conference. At the same time as the General Conference, the Missionary Authority held its meeting, to which also belonged a woman who was present as a delegate in Berlin. F. B.

When will the last day come? This question is answered by the "Christlicher Hausfreund", the Adventist newspaper, in its issue of November 5: "No one knows the exact day or time of the return of Jesus. This is so clearly stated that one is amazed that anyone can believe otherwise. Jesus said: 'But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, but My Father alone. Matt. 24:36, which we believe and teach. We have no fellowship with those who determine the year or the day when the Lord shall come. We resist them. It not unfrequently happens, however, that when we begin to lecture in a place, our opponents seek to give the impression that we are such fanatical men as are continually fixing the day on which the Lord is to come. This is a slander, for we do no such thing. But we can know when that event is near, and when the last generation of men will come. To this sentence we call the kind reader's special attention. In regard to this question two extreme directions are taken. Both are contrary to Scripture. One is to fix a definite time for the return of Christ. Such is contrary to the express word of God. The other is to the effect that nothing can be known about this matter, that Christ can come today or only after thousands of years. This direction is as far from the truth as the other, and just as contrary to the Bible, as we shall now show. When Jesus was asked: -What shall be the sign of thy future?' he said that at

Sun, moon and stars signs should happen (Luc. 21, 25. 26.). And further he said: And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, because your redemption draweth nigh.' V. 27, 28. As soon as they saw these signs begin to come to pass, they were to look and wait for the Lord to come. After he had mentioned the similitude of the fig tree, he said: 'So also ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know that the kingdom of God is at hand.' V. 31. How clear is this declaration! When they would see these signs fulfilled, they should know that the kingdom of God was at hand. So then they can know that it is near. The next verse tells us how near it is: 'Verily I say unto you: This generation shall not pass, till all be done/ v. 32. What generation? The answer is given. That generation which sees the signs mentioned, or to which they are proclaimed as such, and which is warned by them, shall not pass away. See vv. 28-32; that is, when the last generation has come, the Lord will give them the signs of the end. So when we see the signs, we can know with certainty that this generation will not pass away until the Lord comes. The same plain truth is found in Marc. 13:39. and Matt. 24:32-37." - True it is, and in our day especially to be emphasized, that every Christian of every generation should at all times be assured of the future of Christ. But it is wrong not only to determine (as Adventists have often done) the day or hour or year of Christ's return, but also to designate the generation which shall be the last on earth. F. B.

Concerning temperance instruction in the public schools, the "Sub-Committee of the Committee to Investigate the Liquor Problem" writes: "It is believed to be a correct representation of the facts that much of the methods and substance of the so-called scientific temperance instruction in the public schools is unscientific and undesirable. It is not in accord with the opinions of a large majority of the leading physiologists of Europe." The "scientific temperance instruction" in many public schools, long since condemned by Holy Scripture and now also by science, consists in cramming into the pupils' heads by word and image how even the most moderate consumption of spiritual beverages is harmful to health and therefore reprehensible and sinful. Of the above committee the *Independent* writes: "No more representative body of men of trained practical intelligence could well have been selected than those which form the committee of fifty to investigate the liquor problem." F. B.

II. Abroad.

The religious statistics of the German Empire as a whole count 222 religious denominations. Of these, 185 are Christian, namely 40 kinds of Protestant, 29 of Catholic, and 107 of "other" Christians (8 kinds of Baptists, 8 of Apostolics, 9 of Methodists, etc.). Then follow the Jews and 14 groups of professors of "other non-Christian religions" (Muhammadans, Buddhists, Brahmins, fire-worshippers, sun-worshippers, etc.). The atheists and materialists are also counted among the 21 following confessions. The last number, 222, bears the heading "Not specified". - This all-encompassing religion statistic is based on the correct idea that every man has a religion, that is, that he makes something (if not the true God, then an idol) his god.

F. B.

Of Luther the German Emperor praised in a speech in the Estates House at Merseburg: "On the other side the towers of Wittenberg greet the stream, where the greatest German man did the greatest liberating deed for the whole world, and let the blows of his hammer resound awakeningly over the German climes." This Kaiser's word caused great rejoicing in Protestant circles. But how does it agree with the declaration of William II. on his third visit to Leo XIII: "I can only pray to God that He may preserve His holiness for the salvation of the whole world for quite a long time to come"? Whoever, then, thinks and speaks of the Pope can have but a rather poor and crooked idea of the greatness of Luther and his work. F. B.

Unitarianism - the "all-embracing religion of mankind". The Unitarians held their religious congress in Amsterdam at the beginning of September. In the "Täglichen Rundschau" Dr. Pfleiderer of the Berlin theological faculty reports on it and praises this congress as a "milestone in the development of religious life". The cause of Unitarianism is now represented only by a vanishing minority, but the future belongs to it. The course of the religious development of mankind was striving with inner necessity toward a unity of spirit, for which the differences of the existing churches would never entirely disappear, but would be reduced to subordinate moments. According to the "E. K. Z." of 18. October, Pfleiderer writes literally: "A foreshadowing of this all-embracing religion of mankind, which, while respecting the historical churches as the necessary paths to the goal, places eternal truth beyond all historical means and should and will bring unity in the spirit to bear beyond the separating ecclesiastical forms - a foreshadowing of this ideal goal in an inconspicuous but future-rich core formed this 'Heresy Concil', as one speaker called the Congress to general acclaim." - That Universalism, Socinianism, and Unitarianism are rampant in all the larger ecclesiastical communities in America, England, and Germany, numerous evidences could be adduced. A typical case is Dr. Pfleiderer himself, who unabashedly professes Unitarianism, although he is a member of the Berlin theological faculty. F. B.

Thwarted Docentengottesdienste in Bonn. In Bonn, the stronghold of the liberals, Weinel and others have made an attempt to preach their gospel of modern man to the people not only from the university chairs, but also from the pulpits. This plan, however, was thwarted by the Consistory. The "Christl. Welt" writes: "It remains the same: 1. academic theologians have expressed the desire for regular preaching. 2. a presbytery has adopted this desire and applied for their appointment to the preaching ministry in a legally permissible form. (It even submitted the form of a certificate of appointment to the Consistory.) 3 The Consistory, after half a year's reflection, denied the request without providing any valid reasons. (4) The same Bonn congregation, through the same organs, has granted the pulpit to Evangelist Keller from Dusseldorf, but is prevented by the Consistory from hearing ordained preachers who are their own presbyters. Church authorities should be glad if in our days of tension between pulpit and lectern professors push themselves to preach, and if there are congregations that know how to remove the obstacles that so easily stand in the way of such a request." - We add as a sixth sentence: "Professors who do not belong in the pulpit do not belong in the theological chair which is to train preachers for the pulpit.
F. B.

According to the "Old Faith," there are thirty-nine positive and thirty liberal pastors in Hamburg. "For the positive, Christianity is a revealed religion, the Bible is God's Word, Christ is the Son of God, who carried out God's eternal plan to save sinners through his humiliation in earthly life, his suffering and death, and who is confirmed by God in his resurrection as the victor over sin and death. For the moderns, Christianity is essentially only a natural religion that has taken the place of less valuable religions and of which it remains to be seen whether it will not some day be replaced by a more valuable one. The Bible is a human history and reading book like other books. Christ in his person is not salvation. He is not the God-sent Saviour, but the Teacher, naturally limited by his time, and standing, together with his apostles, on a far lower level of knowledge than men and especially the theologians of the twentieth century." And these positive and liberal pastors, who oppose each other in the pulpits like Yes and No, cultivate ecclesiastical fellowship in the city conferences to the great annoyance of all! F. B.

The "Old Faith" writes about the "black danger" in Germany: "Our official appeasement councils are once again at work to relegate the 'black danger' to the realm of dreams. In this case it is statistics which must faithfully serve them. They teach that the conversions from the Roman to the Protestant Churches in Germany are almost ten times, and in Prussia itself thirteen times as numerous as conversions from the Protestant to the Roman Church. In 1900 the numbers for the whole German Empire were 6104 to 669, for Prussia alone 4637 to 355. Even in Saxony, where Roman propaganda is working with particular vigor, the ratio is still 570 to 46, while in Bavaria, however, there are only 257 to 147. Any statistic that does not strive for the greatest possible completeness is worthless. Only recently, however, one of the most distinguished organs of German Ultramontanism confessed that the German conversion statistics are quite unreliable, since a large part of the conversions to the Roman Church are not even officially known. And history confirms this fact. There have been 'crypto-Catholics' not only in high court offices, but even among the Protestant clergy. In addition to this, the statistics do not give the slightest information about the distribution of the conversions among the individual estates, and are also silent about how the conversion of a man or a woman affects the whole family. One only has to take a look at the -Gothaische Hofkalender', and one will be amazed at the consequences that the conversion or the marriage of a single man can have. Entire noble families have been lost to the Protestant faith in this way and, as the history of the Saxon nobility shows, are still being lost to it. It must be admitted, however, that the religious attraction of Romanism is at present still slight in Germany. What will happen in the future, however, when one princely throne after another passes to the Catholic lines, or when the surfeit of modern culture, with its inner instability and lack of peace, spreads still further, no one can say. For today, therefore, it is sufficient to say that no sensible person thinks primarily of the proselytizing zeal of the Roman priest when he thinks of the 'black danger'. The progress of the Roman Church in Germany lies in quite other spheres, above all in that of popular conversion, of officialdom, of Parliament, and of high politics."

Unfaithfulness among the Episcopalians. As in the Lutheran state churches, so in the state church of England, unbelief is prevalent. Professors and preachers, it is true, profess the 39 Articles, but an alien meaning is attached to the words, and deliberately so. Dean Freemantle, for instance, denies all the miracles of the Bible, and yet remains in office. The same is true of the editor of the radical *Encyclopaedia Biblica,* Cheyne. In the August number of the *Contemporary Review the* question is now raised, "Is it common honesty in clergymen to deny or explain away the literal and grammatical sense of parts of the Creed and Articles, to remain in their official positions and enjoy their emoluments while teaching opinions contrary to the general view of the Church?" In other words, has a preacher the right to be paid by the Church for depriving her of Christianity and destroying the confession to which she has committed him? The writer in the *Contemporary Review* answers: It is true that most preachers and laymen would immediately answer this question in the negative, but those who are well instructed and look at the matter historically will judge differently. Biblical and secular knowledge is constantly advancing. Divine inspiration leads the men of the twentieth century, just as it did the apostles of the first, to ever deeper knowledge of God. That is why the theologian can claim the right to infuse the old word with new meaning. There is a consensus in the Church, not expressed but well understood, that this freedom is honorable and justifiable. This also seems to be the *Churchman*'s view. At any rate, he acts on this principle. But even moral laws are not made by the consensus of scholars, but by God's Word. And as long as this is the case, it must be called unfairness if someone signs a confession (in which the thought is always the essential thing) and then sets to work to destroy the content of it and replace it with his own thoughts. F. B.

The following facts prove **how in France the radical spirit is spreading** like a cancer: Free-thinking societies are springing up in the lyceums, whose members undertake to attend no more religious services, but to take part in all anticlerical manifestations. At the last congress of the Teaching League, a motion was made to admit only those teachers to the people's universities who are free from any religious belief. A counter-motion, which sought to have personal convictions respected, was voted down. A professor of the Sorbonne, Aulard, declared in a public controversy with the well-known philosopher and deputy Buisson: "Only no ambiguity! We want to destroy religion!" *Action*, a chief journal of the Radicals, wrote: "If our party had power in its hands, we would soon be done with the churches; we would already know how to destroy them by a series of rapid, immediate, and decisive measures, without worrying about vain liberal sophisms. Religion is a disease that must be eradicated like tuberculosis." - The same aims are pursued in Germany by the Social Democrats with their sentence: "Religion is a private matter." At the Social-Democratic Party Congress in Dresden, for example, a motion was made to the effect that it should be forbidden to give religious instruction to children under sixteen years of age.

F. B.

Pornographic literature and shameful images are still allowed to wreak their havoc in France with impunity, and not at least in Paris itself. Since complaints and charges brought against them have been of no avail,

the Eglise *libre* wrote in the most painful indignation: "Under the second Empire, which was already a time of rapid and strong decline, one cried out: Instruction! Freedom! Then everything will flourish again! Instruction was given, freedom shone forth, ... but we are always going downhill. And the cause of this decline is largely bad literature. The people can read, but what do they read, what have they been given to read? After 1870 we should have needed men who would have worked on the uplift of the people. Instead we got the pornographers. They said to the people: Believe nothing, love nothing, smoke opium! Dull yourself, my friend, bury your strength in shameful pleasures. It is all nothing, heaven is empty, renounce all hope, give up the future, time and eternity. Go down to the grave with songs of mockery on thy lips. Drink and be merry, wretch, for there is nothing on earth. But especially buy our vile colored paper. . . Do you see down there that great abyss into which the nations plunge? Go thou dancing towards it, the bottle of rubbish in thy hand. Go on, France may disappear, leaving only a shameful memory. We don't care if only we get rich. - That was, soon in finer, soon in coarser style, the literature fin de siécle. These people) our worst enemies, deserved the galleys and the gallows, but - they were decorated!"

(A. E. L. K.)

Russian Getvaltacte. The "A. E. L. K." writes on October 16: "Some time ago the newspapers brought the news that the Russian government had decreed that the Armenian-Gregorian church would no longer be allowed to administer its property independently, and that the government wanted to take it over. Such a brutal act of violence did not seem credible even to connoisseurs of Russian conditions, and even when individual daily papers reported that Armenian parishioners in some places had put up armed resistance to a Russian commission which had come there to take possession of the church property, one could still think that this resistance had been directed at a predatory action on the part of individual Russian chinowniks. Now, of course, after the government has published the more detailed provisions on the taking over of the church property of the Armenian-Gregorian Church, all doubts must vanish." According to these regulations, the government will take from the Armenians all possessions of houses, mills, wine cellars, land and forest estates, all interest-bearing papers and all cash sums in excess of one thousand. The patriarchs, bishops, and priests are left only their residences with their gardens and small sums of cash for current church expenses. The purpose of this judicial robbery is to destroy the Armenian schools, which were maintained from the confiscated funds and goods, because the children in them would not be educated in the Russian sense. The Armenian Archbishop Mkirtitsch has now, in a public service in Tiflis, solemnly pronounced the ecclesiastical curse upon the Czar and the government of Defsen, which had hitherto been directed only against the Sultan and the Shah of Persia. That the Emperor of Russia also has a Lord in heaven, with whom there is no respect of person, the Czar does not seem to believe. F. B.

Russia **an enemy of the evangelical mission.** The "Reformation" writes on October 18: "Grave danger threatens the evangelical mission through the advance of Russia in East Asia." The third article of the latest treaty with Tibet reads: "In Tibet, complete religious liberty, so far as it concerns the Russian Orthodox faith and Lamaism, is to be introduced; on the other hand, all other religious teachings are to be absolutely forbidden." In Manchuria

the Russian officials in every way the reopening of the stations destroyed in the Boxer turmoil. Manchuria has already been placed under the supervision of the Greek Archimandrite at Peking, and all Christian preaching forbidden except that of the Greek Orthodox Church. Several chapels of the Scottish mission have been summarily handed over to Russian priests. When the mission doctor, Dr. Greig, broke through the military cordon last year to visit the deserted northern mission posts, he was sent back under police guard. The prospects for the mission in Manchuria are very dim. And this area was among the most fertile mission fields in China!

The **command to baptize, Matth. 28, is** considered spurious by modern theology, as recently proclaimed by Harnack. Prof. Riggenbach-Basel (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, edited by Dr. Schlatter and Dr. Cremer, VII, I. 1903) has taken the trouble to examine the historical testimony of the command to baptize again most exactly. The result is exactly as it was to be expected. As far as we can trace the Gospel of Matthew, it has never concluded otherwise than in our present manuscripts. Now writes in the "Ev. Kirchenbl. f. Württ." Prof. Dr. Eberhard Nestle-Maulbronn, the well-known editor of the new manual edition of the Greek New Testament: "I can add to Riggenbach's evidence another not unimportant one. Also in the great Tischendorf and in all commentaries known to me, there is no indication that in the Syriac translation Matth. 28, 18. f. it reads: 'All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me: and as my Father has sent me, so I send you. Go ye therefore, teach all nations, etc. This addition, which is found in all the compared manuscripts, and which is ascribed to the 7th canon, that is, to the passages which Matthew and John have in common, can only be explained in this place in the Syriac Bible as a remnant of Tatian's Diatessaron, and so there will be no doubt that this also already had the Trinitarian command to baptize; and like Tatian, so also his teacher Justin, of whom in more recent times the proof has been attempted that he also already used a Gospel harmony. To call the Trinitarian baptismal command an 'interpolation' justifies nothing at all, in my opinion, from the text-critical point of view." (Ref.)

About **the origin of life** Lionel Smith Beal, of King's College, London, in a speech before the Victoria Institute, thus expressed himself: "The distinction between every kind of life and every kind of none-life is absolute, and there is no evidence in support of the view that any kind of life has proceeded, or has been in any way obtained, from non-life. Whilst it is certain that our world must have been formed ages (?) before the appearance of one living particle, there is no evidence justifying the idea of the gradual production of a living organism from any matter or any combination of living substances. The infinite, designing, directing, sustaining power of the eternal living God, as it seems to me, looking from the science side only, must be acknowledged in every kind of living matter and at every period of life." - If science compels us to attribute the origin of life to a creative act of God, what compels us to depart from what Genesis 1 reports about the origin of the earth? The omnipotence that creates life does not need endless periods of time to prepare the earth for life.

F. B.

On the question of whether the days of creation must be regarded **as periods,** E. Hoppe says in the "Old Faith" of October 25, among other things, the following: "On the other hand, however, the calculations that individual natural periods of time have to be made have also been very different.

The only thing that can be said is that the numbers that researchers have found good to use for the length of periods are of no value at all. For they apply insufficient standards, taken from the present, to temporal relations and conditions that are of a completely different nature, and must therefore also arrive at completely untenable figures that cannot be compared among themselves at all. Instead of all further explanations only one example! The oldest coal was estimated to have taken from a hundred thousand to several million years to form, because it was believed that graphite could only be formed from coal by slow combustion in the absence of air and under very high pressure. Last year, however, the transformation of coal into graphite was completed in an electric furnace at about 2500 degrees Celsius in less than twelve hours. Since then, this calculation has lost all foundation, since we cannot judge whether similar conditions, as they are artificially produced in the laboratory, have not really occurred in nature. If so, twenty-four hours would have been sufficient for the oldest coal time. For this reason, I consider the calculation of periods in natural research to be an idle gimmick without any scientific significance .

Botany against Darwinism. In the "Reformation" of October 18, Dr. Dennert reports that the famous Berlin botanist S. Schwendener, on the occasion of a natural science holiday course in Berlin on October 10, 1902, also spoke out against Darwinism in a report entitled "Ueber den gegenwärtigen Stand der Descendenzlehre in der Botanik. The "Reformation" writes: "Schwendener now believes that the Darwinian theory of breeding selection is well-founded for the emergence of cultural races in plants and domestic animals through human breeding selection. On the other hand, the transfer of the selection principle to plants of the wild, where the struggle for existence is supposed to act in a similar way as in the case of cultivated plants the arbitrary selection by human hands, has over the years aroused various reservations which, in my opinion, are justified. Schwendener then adopts Nägel's sharp criticism and comes to the conclusion that Darwinism cannot be proven. Certain explanations of it he calls -fully unsatisfactory, not to say fabulous-fantastic'. Accordingly, the doctrine of the formation of new forms through continued selection in the struggle for existence stands on weak feet; it is not able to provide conclusive facts that would necessarily have to be interpreted in its favor/ Schwendener also cites the testimony of another well-known botanist, R. v. Weitstem. Weitstem, who occupied himself for years with relevant studies and came to the conclusion: 'So far, not a single example has become known to me that would prove the validity of Darwinism in the narrower sense in the state of nature/ We add another characteristic word of Schwendener: 'The whole attempt, initially received with true enthusiasm, to place the struggle for existence in free nature as an analogue with the same, even if unconsciously summoning effects, at the side of the human will, which conditions the successes in artificial breeding selection, can therefore not be called successful/' - The descendency itself, however, neither Dennert nor Schwendener deny, they only reject the Darwinian form of the same. F. B.

Notice.

"Lehre und Wehre," now about to begin its 50th year, will be published 48 pages a month from next January, and without any increase in price. The Editorial Board.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 49. December 1903. No. 12.

Use and abuse of the analogy of faith.

(Continued instead of ending.)

We have given some examples of how the analogy of faith has been invoked in order to reject clear doctrines of Scripture under a good pretense. We have purposely chosen such examples in which just about everything that still calls itself Lutheran admits an abuse of the analogy of faith. When Nestorius denies that the Son of God was born of the virgin and crucified, because this contradicts the analogy of faith, and when the Reformed, under the same pretense, deny the essential presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, Lutherans are generally agreed that an evil game is being played here with the analogy of faith, or rather with the harmonization of the statements of Scripture.

We now go one step further with Luther. We point out that the reinterpretation of clear scriptural statements is based on a falsification of the analogy of faith. When the Reformers claimed that the essential presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper contradicted the teaching of Scripture concerning the true human nature of Christ, the ascension of Christ, and His sitting at the right hand of God, Luther proved to them that they did not determine the attributes of the human nature of Christ according to Scripture, but according to their own thoughts, that they did not have Scriptural thoughts, but "childish, carnal thoughts" concerning the ascension of Christ and His sitting at the right hand of God. 1) The situation which arises from the Reformed polemic against the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper is this: in that the Reformed depart from the wording of Scripture in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and that in the supposed interest of preserving the analogy of faith, it becomes evident that they also reject the doctrine of the person of Christ.

1) St. L. ed. XX, 802 ff.

Falsify Christ. They denied, against the clear Scriptures, that the human nature of Christ **communicated** the divine glory and divine attributes, and especially the illocal, divine manner of being present. The reformed "analogy of faith" turns out, on closer analysis, to be the philosophical proposition: "**Finitum non est capax infiniti,**" the finite is not capable of the infinite, a proposition that basically annuls the incarnation of the Son of God and thus the whole of Christianity.

Here again the wonderful unity and inner harmony of the holy Scriptures comes to light. The Scriptures are so harmonious that, if they are distorted in one doctrine, other doctrines are immediately affected. As soon as anyone is compelled to do violence to clear words of Scripture in the interest of his point of view, it is a sign that somewhere, or even in several places, he is not quite right. We will endeavor to prove in detail that all those who reinterpret clear words of Scripture do not use the **analogia fidei** as a standard, but their own opinion, and make it the principle of their interpretation of Scripture.

We now want to explain this in more detail with regard to the doctrine of election by grace. We will prove that if the doctrine of election by grace, and especially the relation of election by grace to the temporal Christian state of the elect, is kept to the clear wording of Scripture, it is in harmony with the analogy of faith, and especially with the doctrine of the general way of salvation. But if one permits himself to depart from the wording of Scripture in the manner formerly and now popular, this involves a violation of the analogy of faith, a falsification of the doctrine of the general way of salvation, nay, at bottom a complete denial of the gospel.

If we stick to the wording of Scripture in the doctrine of election by grace, we have the doctrine that Christians owe their temporal state of grace, from the calling to the introduction into eternal life, to their eternal election, or that the temporal state of grace is a consequence of their eternal election. 2 Tim. 1:9: "God hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ JEsu before the times of the world." Acts. 13, 48. "And believed, as many as were ordained unto eternal life." Rom. 8:29, 30: "Whom he hath before ordained to be conformed to the likeness of his Son, etc., he hath also ordained to be conformed to the likeness of his Son. And whom he hath ordained, them hath he also called: whom he hath called, them hath he also justified: whom he hath justified, them hath he also glorified." Eph. 1, 3-5. "Blessed be God and the Father of our

Our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things through Christ. Forasmuch then as he hath chosen us through him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love, and hath ordained us to filial piety toward himself, through JESUS CHRIST." These and other passages of Scripture, which speak **disertis verbis** concerning the relation of eternal election to the temporal state of grace of the children of God, are not obscure, but clear. So clear that every simple-minded Christian who reads or hears them immediately understands them correctly, and on the basis of them believes that eternal election is a cause of his temporal state of grace. As also the Concordia formula confesses, on the basis of the wording of the Scripture concerning the election of grace: "The eternal election of God does not only see and know beforehand the blessedness of the elect, but is also of the gracious will and good pleasure of God in Christ Jesus a cause, so that our blessedness, and that which belongs to it, creates, works, helps, and promotes." 1) And again, "God hath in such his counsel, interposition, and ordinance, not only prepared salvation in general, but hath also in grace provided for all and every person of the elect, who are to be saved by Christ, and hath chosen them to salvation, and ordained that he would bring, help, promote, strengthen, and preserve them in this manner, as now reported, by his grace, gifts, and effect." 2) Thus Chemnitz also says, sticking to the wording of Holy Scripture, "So also the election of God does not follow according to our faith and righteousness, but goes before as a cause of it all. For whom he hath ordained or chosen, he hath also called and justified, Rom. 8. And Eph. 1 Paul saith not, that we are chosen, because we were holy, or shall be holy; but saith, We are chosen, that we might be holy. For election by grace is the cause of all that pertains to salvation, as Paul says: 'We are come to inheritance, which were ordained beforehand according to the purpose of him that worketh all things after the counsel of his will, that we should be something to the praise of his glory: and according to the working thereof we believe,' etc." 3)

Now of this doctrine, according to which God, in the eternal election, did not look to the better conduct of the elect, etc., but elected only by grace in Christ according to the good pleasure of his will, it has, however, been asserted from the beginning that it was against the analogy of faith, violated the general way of salvation, robbed the Christians of comfort, etc. Thus it was argued against the Concordia formula, and thus, as is well known, it is argued against us to this day.

But one is caught in a great delusion. The doctrine just described, arising from the wording of Scripture, is not in contradiction, but in harmony with what we otherwise learn from the sacred

1) Müller, p. 705. 2) Müller, p. 708. 3) Enchiridion, p. 109.

We know this much from the Scriptures concerning the general way of salvation and the blessedness of men. Leaving out of account the scriptures concerning eternal election, we know this much: that all men who are saved are saved by grace alone, for Christ's sake, through faith in Christ. Eph. 2:8, 9: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." By grace God hath brought the gospel to them, Isa. 65:1; by grace God worketh in them faith in the gospel, Eph. 1:19, 20: "We believe according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead." By grace he preserveth faith in them unto the end, 1 Pet. 1:5: "Ye which by the power of God are preserved unto salvation through faith." So quite apart from what Scripture says of eternal election, we know this much, that the beginning, means, and end of the Christian course depend on God's working of grace in Christ. Phil. 2:13: "God is he that worketh in you both to will and to do, according to his good pleasure." If we now turn our attention to the passages in the Scriptures which deal with eternal election, we learn basically only one new thing, namely, that God has already determined from eternity to do to all who are blessed what he does in time. In the passages dealing with eternal election, the Scriptures reveal to us that God has already from eternity provided for his children with calling, conversion, justification, sanctification, and preservation; that he has chosen them for this purpose, ordained them for it, etc. Here is no contradiction of the Gospel, but merely confirmation of what we otherwise already know of the way of salvation and of the blessedness of men. Therefore also the Concordia formula says of its doctrine of eternal election, according to which election is a cause of faith and of the whole Christian state of the elect: "It **confirms** mightily the article, that we are justified and saved without all our works and merits, purely by grace, for Christ's sake alone. For before the time of the world, before we were, yea, before the foundation of the world was laid, when we could do no good, we are saved by grace in Christ, according to God's reckoning, Rom. 9, 2 Tim. 1. By this also all ***opiniones*** and erroneous doctrines are put down from the powers of our natural will, because God in his counsel before the times of the world purposed and ordained that he would himself create and work in us all things pertaining to our conversion by the power of his Holy Spirit through the word." 1)

In contrast to this, the doctrine, according to which God, in the eternal election

1) Müller, p. 713 f.

should have looked to the better conduct of the elect, is at once at variance with clear Scripture, or with the analogy of faith. According to all else we know of the gospel and the way of salvation, God worketh faith, and God receiveth faith by grace for Christ's sake, according to his good pleasure. Phil. 2:13: "God it is that worketh in you both to will and to do, according to his good pleasure." "Better conduct" as a ground or "explanatory ground" of conversion and preservation in the faith is contrary to the gospel, because the gospel by grace makes blessed. All Scripture protests against the view that God converts and saves those who are less guilty before God, who are better or behave better than others. There is no difference among men; they are all alike dead in sins, and all alike utterly unfit for the faith, and full of enmity against the gospel. There is not the least concession in any man. But the gospel lifts us out of the **massa perdita**. "God, who is rich in mercy, through his great love, having loved us when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." Eph. 2:4, 5, 8, 9. Thus it is quite clear that every doctrine according to which conversion and preservation in the faith, instead of being due to God's grace in Christ alone, is also due to the conduct of man, is contrary to the gospel and the general way of salvation. The general way of salvation is a way of grace. He who teaches a general way of salvation, according to which God converts and makes blessed those who in some way profitably differ from others, does not teach the way of salvation of Scripture, but has invented a way of salvation for himself. He is also in contradiction with the "rule of faith" as compiled from Scripture in our Small Lutheran Catechism. The Small Catechism says: "I believe that I cannot of my own reason nor strength believe in JEsum Christum, my Lord, or come to Him, but the Holy Spirit has called me through the Gospel, enlightened me with His gifts, sanctified and preserved me in the right faith." In short, the matter stands thus: with the way of salvation taught in holy Scripture and testified to in the Lutheran Small Catechism, agrees only the doctrine of eternal election, according to which God did not regard any better conduct in the elect, but merely endowed them by grace for Christ's sake with faith and preservation in faith. On the other hand, the way of salvation taught in the Holy Scriptures and testified to in the Lutheran Small Catechism is contradicted by every doctrine according to which God is supposed to have regarded better conduct, less reluctance, less guilt, etc. in the case of eternal election.

Thus one operates with a counterfeit analogy of faith, with a counterfeit gospel, and with a counterfeit way of salvation, when one has formerly and now asserted that an eternal election solely by grace for Christ's sake to faith and to the whole Christian state violates the analogy of faith, the general way of salvation, and the gospel, as it is otherwise taught in Scripture. The whimsical "analogy of faith" according to which, since Melanchthon, one has wanted to regulate and "interpret" the clear statements of Scripture concerning the election of grace, is clearly discernible. How the Reformed opposition to the communication of the divine glory to the human nature of Christ is not supported by any Scriptural statement, but by the human proposition: **Finitum non est capax infiniti**," so the opposition to the doctrine of Christ, according to which the whole temporal state of grace and specifically also the faith of Christians is a consequence and effect of their eternal election, is based on the rationalistic proposition which Melanchthon formulated thus: **Necesse est**, ***in nobis*** **esse aliquam discriminis causam" etc.**,
there must necessarily be in us men a cause of difference, etc. It is taken for granted, as an axiom: Those who are converted and saved, or rather chosen, must in some way be better, or behave better, be less guilty, resist less, etc., than those who are lost. This abominable proposition, which at bottom overthrows the whole gospel of grace and the whole of Christianity, dominates all dogmatic expositions and all exegetical expositions, which since the sixteenth century have been directed against the doctrine of Scripture and of the confession, that election is a cause of faith and of the whole Christian state of the elect. One deceives oneself and others if one thinks that one wants to regulate the passages of Scripture which deal with the relationship of faith to election according to Scripture or according to the analogy of faith. One wants to interpret the passages of Scripture in such a way that they are connected with the sentence: **Necesse est, in nobis esse aliquam discriminis causam**.

Furthermore, it is a characteristic of right doctrine that it neither leads to carnal security nor to despair. But this characteristic, too, is inherent in the doctrine, with which we adhere to the wording of Scripture, and according to which the whole temporal state of Christianity is a consequence of eternal election. On the basis of Scripture we do not teach a mere separation of persons, but a taking out of the world and a preservation from the world through the means of grace and in the way of conversion, justification, sanctification, patience under the cross, etc. All this already belongs to eternal election. All this belongs already to eternal election. Thus the scriptural doctrine of election urges the diligent use of the means of grace, the continual examination whether one is also in the faith, and the unregenerate use of the means of grace.

We are calling for the crucifixion of the flesh, for patient perseverance under the cross, etc. We also refer here to the experience of all Christians who, by God's grace, know and practice the scriptural doctrine of election. The doctrine, on the other hand, according to which God is said to have looked to the better conduct in eternal election, drives either into despair or into carnal security. The Christian who knows himself knows that nothing good dwells in him, that is, in his flesh. If then eternal election stands on his conduct, he must despair. Or it may happen that a Christian thinks he will do better than others. Then he is like Peter. Peter said to the Lord: "Even if all were angry, I would not be angry", Marc. 14, 29. Soon after Peter fell most shamefully of all the disciples.

There is really nothing wrong with the objection that the doctrine of election, which we teach and confess on the basis of the clear words of Scripture, conflicts with the gospel and the general way of salvation, or leads to despair and carnal security.

Let us now examine the doctrine of election in regard to faith, and its relation to the gospel. F. P.

(Conclusion follows.)

Recent Pentateuch Criticism.

(Continued.)

II.

On the history of criticism.

3.

The recent deed hypothesis.

We have so far considered the main earlier hypotheses of the critics concerning the origin of the Pentateuch, the older documentary hypothesis, the fragmentary hypothesis, and the supplementary hypothesis. The discussion of the so-called recent documentary hypothesis now brings us to the most recent time, to the last half century.

The progress (in a certain sense also regress) from the supplementary to the documentary hypothesis was quite natural. We used to call the supplementary hypothesis a mere transitional stage. That is what it really was. For in fact it, too, is based on the assumption of two documents, except that it does not allow these documents to have equal rights. It makes the Jahvist a mere "supplement. The vast majority of the higher scholars soon rose up against this view.

Critics. They, who did not want to know anything more about Moses as the author of the Pentateuch and mastered God's word in the Pentateuch like a textbook, called the main weakness of the supplementary hypothesis the low esteem of the Jahvist. One of its well-known recent exponents, Cornill, already often mentioned, says: "This most excellent of Pentateuchal writers, to whom belongs everything that gives charm and life to the narrative, should be merely a dependent 'supplementer'?" 1) Now and never. Take, it was said, from the earlier hypotheses the moments of truth and, avoiding the extremes, unite them into a higher truth. The older Documentary Hypothesis, and still more the Fragmentary Hypothesis, had unilaterally cultivated and promoted analysis, the distinction of sources; the Supplementary Hypothesis, on the other hand, had emphasized synthesis, the assembling of sources, but equally unilaterally. Now it was necessary to give both their right, not to overlook one above the other, but to separate out clearly and purely the individual components of the Pentateuch by correct analysis, and then to unite these components by correct synthesis into the systematic whole that is before us in the Pentateuch. This, in the opinion of today's critics, is accomplished by the newer documentary hypothesis, which has been dealing with this matter for the last fifty years, and to which, in fact, almost all "scientific" Old Testament theologians of the present time adhere. However different their views are in detail - and hardly two agree with each other in the details - they all agree that Moses in no way wrote the Pentateuch, but that this written work is composed of various documents. Strack, in his "Introduction to the Old Testament," states, and has also expressly told the writer of this, that "the traditional apologetic direction, which expressly or in fact denies the right of critical research even in the writings of the Old and New Testaments" (and what he understands by this is well enough known from his works), "at the present time no longer has in Germany a single representative worth mentioning. 2) With Keil and Bachmann, both of whom died in 1888, the last professors of the Old Testament disciplines who still held to the Mosaic version of the Pentateuch have departed from life; Dr. Nösgen in Rostock, to our knowledge the only living German university professor who still defends the Mosaicism of the Pentateuch, is not an Old Testament but a New Testament exegete, and the two German pastors who in recent years have vigorously defended the Old Testament and quite specifically the Pentateuch against the higher critics, the late reformed Dr. A. Zahn and the still living Dr. E. Zahn.

1) "Introduction to the Old Testament." Second edition, p. 23.
2) S. 7.

Rupprecht, are not recognized by the guild of "scientific" theologians and are only very rarely taken into account. In England, however, it is about the same as in Germany, and in the United States also the representatives of the Old Testament subjects at the well-known large universities are loud higher critics and fighters of the Mosaic version of the Pentateuch, since the meritorious W. H. Green of Princeton, the "North American Hengstenberg," passed away some years ago. 1)

But let us now come a little closer to this newer hypothesis 2). Its first forerunner was Gramberg, who, in a work on Genesis, sought to divide all parts of it between an Elohist and a Jehovist, and attributed what could be attributed neither to this nor to that to a compiler who, partly at his own discretion, partly from tradition, made additions, filled in gaps, and made changes in the names of God. Gramberg followed Stähelin with a similar separation of the documents, who, however, as already noted, soon advocated the addition hypothesis. The newer hypothesis of documentary evidence was then actually introduced by Ewald, who in his much-named "History of the People of Israel," published in 1843, changed his opinion for the third and not yet the last time, and distinguished seven documents in the Pentateuch. 3) He calls these source writings by the following names and has the following to say about their origin, which at the same time gives an insight into the delusion of this criticism: 1. the "Book of Covenants", "written by a member of the tribe of Judah in the time of the judges during the short happy rise of Samson", who, however, "already used older written sources. The "Book of Origins", written by a Levite shortly "after the great event of the dedication of Solomon's temple".

1) From Keil especially his "Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments" is to be mentioned, distinguished by richness, skillful, clear presentation and sharp criticism of the various hypotheses about the origin of the Pentateuch; it does not, however, take into account the very latest phases of Pentateuch criticism, since the last, third edition was published already in 1873; von Rupprecht especially "Das Rätsel des Fünfbuches Mose und seine falsche Lösung", "Des Rätsels Lösung" and "Wissenschaftliches Handbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament", the latter work very detailed, admittedly also somewhat broad; von Green especially "The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch" unb "The Unity of the Book of Genesis", the former work historical-critical, the latter factual-critical, following the modern-critical source distinction step by step through the whole of Genesis and refuting it.

2) The designation "newer deed hypothesis" has been suggested by Kamphausen, because it is essentially based on the older deed hypothesis of Astruc, Eichhorn and Jlgen, but develops it further, taking into account the supplementary hypothesis.

3) Cf. also the note in the November issue, p. 335.

The third narrator of the primitive stories, "rather belonging to the northern kingdom", "may be assumed to have lived in the 10th or 9th century". The third narrator of the prehistoric tales, "belonging rather to the northern kingdom," of whom it may be supposed that "he lived in the 10th or 9th century. 4. the fourth narrator of the Primitive Histories, "from whose hand the whole of the present Pentateuch, with the book of Joshua, is derived, except ... . three kinds of additions"; he "cannot have written earlier, nor later, than the first half or towards the middle of the eighth century." 5. the passage Lev. 26:3-45, written by a "descendant of the exiles of the northern kingdom" about 700. 6. The "Deuteronomist," a Judean, who "wrote about.... during the second half of the reign of King Manasseh, and indeed wrote in Egypt." 7. the passage Deut. Cap. 33, "by an otherwise unknown poet of Jeremiah's time." 1) In the later editions of his work Ewald again changed his views in individual points, and also excluded two other source writings; but it may be said that his "Book of Origins" corresponds on the whole to the older Elohist already assumed in the older documentary hypothesis, his third narrator to the younger Elohist, and his fourth narrator to the Jahvist, and one might therefore regard Ewald as the father of the newer documentary hypothesis. That this does not usually happen is due to the fact that in Ewald's views and explanations, even in the opinion of his own colleagues, too many untenable and fantastic things were included, which he nevertheless decreed with his characteristic passion as established truth.

Hupfeld is usually regarded as the actual scientific founder of the Urkundenhypothese, which is at present as well as generally accepted, and by whom, in 1853, that is, just a hundred years after Astruc's book on Genesis, appeared the much-mentioned writing: "Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung von neuem untersucht." In these investigations three sources of Genesis are asserted with confident certainty by a true rationalist who follows his reason throughout, namely, the primeval or elder Elohist, the second or younger Elohist, and the Jahvist. All three are connected and complete documents, and written without regard to each other. The combination of these three charters into the present whole is the work of a later redactor. The old Ilgen thus had, as Hupfeld himself said, "the most brilliant satisfaction and salvation of honor"; the "loutish years of Pentateuch criticism," as Cornill expresses himself in reference to Ilgen's work, 2) were over; manhood had arrived, for Hupfeld remains, after

1) The citations in Cornill, p. 24 f.
2) Introduction, p. 19.

to the aforementioned Cornill "the undisputed merit to have led the Pentateuch analysis permanently on the right track". 1) Böhmer first followed in Hupfeld's footsteps, continued his work, and especially emphasized the supposed "additions to the redaction" in his differentiation of sources. And soon followed the work in which for the first time the differentiation of sources for the entire Pentateuch was carried out, verse by verse and word by word - Knobel's completely rationalistic multi-volume commentary on the Pentateuch in the "Kurzgefaßten exegetischen Handbuch zum Alten Testament", the last parts of which appeared in 1861 with an exposition of the critical views of their author. Knobel also accepts the source writings that we have now already repeatedly encountered: the Grundschrift or the older Elohist from the time of Saul and the Jahvist from the time of Hezekiah. Between the two, however, there were two more adaptations of the old stories and laws, the so-called "book of law", the Jos. 10, 13. and 2 Sam. 1, 18. mentioned "book of the pious or righteous", which essentially coincides with the younger Elohist, and the so-called "book of war", the 4 Mos. 21, 14. mentioned "book of the fights of the Lord". From these three writings the Jahvist, of course adding his own pieces, then created a unified work, and to this thus composed and completed Elohistic-Jahvistic work the "Deuteronomist," a zealous theocrat in the time of King Josiah, probably the high priest Hilkiah, finally added Deut. Cap. 1-30 and had the whole work sent to the king as one found in the temple (2 Kings 22). If some of Knobel's views are now abandoned by the critics, namely his opinion about the war book and about the collaboration of the work by the Jahvist, Cornill still says in his frivolous way: "If one considers that Knobel was the first who undertook to clear this primeval forest, then for a fair assessment the recognition of the many and great things he has accomplished must far outweigh the rebuke of those things in which he has erred." 2) Simultaneously with Knobel's Commentary appeared another much-mentioned work, by the Dutchman Kuenen, "Historisch-kritische Untersuchung über die Entstehung und Sammlung der Bücher des Alten Bundes," to the second edition of which we shall return later, but which, even in the first edition, stands entirely on the ground of the newer documentary hypothesis. Kuenen also adopts the following documents: Book of Origins (Grundschrift, older Elohist), Jahvist, younger Elohist, Deuteronomist, and finally a Redactor. And now book followed book and treatise followed treatise up to the latest time, so that, after we have described the main features of this newer document hypo-

1) Introduction, p. 25.
2) Introduction, p. 26.

In the case of the works that we have described here, it would go too far here to even elaborate on the individual works and to discuss their peculiarities. Suffice it to say that, apart from the exceptions mentioned above, every well-known Old Testament theologian of modern times is in some way a supporter of the hypothesis mentioned. We will mention only a few principal names: Schrader, Graf, Nöldeke, Dillmann, Riehm, Kayser, Kleinert, Reuß, Franz Delitzsch, Strack, Wellhausen, Cornill, Kautzsch, König, Stade, Budde, Holzinger, Gunkel, Steuernagel, and others in Germany; W. R. Smith, Cheyne, Driver, and others in England; W. R. Harper, Haupt, N. Schmidt, Moore, Bacon, Toy, and others in the United States. To them all, whether still "positive," like Strack and King, or mediatorial, like Driver, or radical, like Cornill and Cheyne, the documentary hypothesis is regarded as a foregone truth, put forward with a true confidence of victory. From these names, therefore, we will pick out only two, the bearers of which are probably quite generally regarded as the most important recent representatives of the Documentary Hypothesis, Dillmann, who died a few years ago, and the radical Wellhausen, who is still living, and who is most often mentioned by all recent critics. The former, in his new edition of Knobel's Commentary, assumes that the Hexateuch (for at present the Book of Joshua is almost universally considered to be the sixth part of the Pentateuch) is essentially composed of five writings: the older and younger Elohist, the Jahvist, the Deuteronomist, and the author of the so-called Law of Holiness (Lev. Cap. 17-26). And Wellhausen stands essentially in the same way, only that he lets the aforementioned law of holiness recede more. In his "Composition of the Hexateuch" his numerous followers and disciples see "the newer hypothesis of the Urkunden carried out in the most ingenious and magnificent way". 1) We do not enter into the details of this here, but in the next section; we remark, however, in conclusion, that each of these critics, though he agrees with the others in the assumption of the principal documents mentioned, has again his particular views as to the origin, composition, and number of all the sources, that the pupil, as a rule, corrupts his teacher, and is in turn corrupted by his pupil, so that if one wished to indicate quite exactly how each of these critics first dismembers and then reassembles the Pentateuch, one would have to fill whole pages with tables, as is also done in the latest Old Testament introductions and commentaries on the Pentateuch. L. F.

(To be continued.)

1) Cornill, Introduction, p. 27.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Statistics of the Lutheran Church in North America. Dr. Ochsenford gives the following figures, which are admittedly not universally reliable: 7290 pastors, 12,221 congregations, 1,689,385 confirmed members, 5244 parochial schools, 3350 school teachers, 234, 175 pupils, 6072 Sunday schools, 58,894 Sunday school teachers, 541,659 pupils. 81,684,895.56 for charitable purposes. 116 educational institutions: 23 theological seminaries, with 87 professors and 1021 students, $1,600,000 property and 8768,464 capital; 50 colleges, with 557 professors, 9114 students, 83,022,716 property and $1,016,301 capital; 32 academies, with 146 teachers and 2906 students, 8720, 100 property and 858,000 capital; 11 girls' schools, with 117 teachers and 1043 students and 8583,500 property. Together these 116 institutions have 907 professors, 14,084 students, of whom 2679 are theology students, 86,926,916 property value and 81,842,765 capitals on interest and 335,860 library books. The total value of these institutions is $7,769,681. 103 charitable institutions: 21 hospitals, 46 orphanages, 16 old people's homes, 9 deaconesses' homes, 11 emigrant and seamen's missions. Werth: $4,224,927. Ecclesiastical Leaves 178: 78 English, 56 German, 17 Norwegian, 8 Swedish, 9 Danish, 3 Icelandic, 2 Finnish, 2 Slavonian, 1 French, 1 Latvian and 1 Estonian. The General Council has 1371 pastors, 2213 congregations, and 336, 129 members; 8324,226.02 contributions. The General Synod: 1240 pastors, 1635 congregations, and 213, 109 members; $310,050.67 contributions. The Synodical Conference: 2288 pastors, 2955 congregations, and 531, 390 members; $370,334. 19 contributions. The United Synod of the South: 213 pastors, 429 congregations, and 42,410 members; $819,573.25 contributions. Stand-alone Synods (e.g., Ohio, Iowa, Norwegian, etc.): 2178 pastors, 4989 congregations, and 516,347 members; 8660,711.43 contributions.-On this the *Churchman of* November 21 remarks: "Contributions for missions, domestic and foreign, for educational and institutional work amounts together to little less than $1.00 for each communicant, a record with which our own, we are confident, compares not unfavorably." Had the *Churchman* considered (1) that the members of his church belong largely to the rich, while the great majority of Lutherans are laborers, and (2) that an expensive school system is maintained by most of the German congregations of the Lutheran Church, which is not accounted for, his judgment would have been different. F. B.

Lutheran College of Milwaukee, Wis. Walther College in St. Louis has been the only higher civil school within the Synodical Conference. The beginningTo a second Lutheran college has now been made in Milwaukee. The "E. L. G. B." writes: The conviction that for the higher and further training of our confirmed youth, as such is more and more desired in our circles in recent years, God's Word and the Christian spirit are just as necessary as in the elementary school, has induced a number of Lutherans on the north side to make a beginning in God's name to found a Lutheran college. For the first year this will consist of a day school for girls and an evening school for boys/ With these words was introduced a circular which was distributed at the end of August in the churches of the synodal congregation on the north side of the city of Milwaukee, Wis. The beginning of a Lutheran high school was made in such a way that the Emanuel congregation (P. G. Küchle)

a number of professors, pastors and teachers took over the teaching and a special friend of such a school system provided the money necessary for the establishment. At present, the professors A. Pieper, J. Köhler; the pastors Albrecht, Ebert, Hagedorn, Harders, Knuth, Schlerf, Strafen, Sieck; Dr. Schober, Mr. J. Roß, Mrs. P. Strafen, Fr. J. Salbach; the teachers Albrecht, Gleichmann, Klug, Knief, Reineck, Sampe. Subjects taught are: Religion, History, Natural History, Physics, Physiology, Geography, German, English, Latin, French, Drawing, Fine Writing, Singing, Algebra, Arithmetic, Bookkeeping, Shorthand, Physical Exercises, etc. The school is attended by 65 pupils, some of whom have come from out of town and have been placed in suitable families.... The temporary head is Father J. F. G. Harders. The financial management is in the hands of a society: P. Harders, 1234 Holton St., president; P. O. Hagedorn, 404 Thomas St., secretary; E. Sampe, 1131 Island Ave. treasurer." - It is well known that the modern astronomical, geological and biological false doctrines of the origin of the world and of our earth with its plants, animals and human beings (false doctrines which in many cases are already creeping into the grammar schools) are being cultivated and pushed with great vigor in the high schools and universities of our country, and that, in fact, even in these schools, although they want to and are supposed to be religionless, the religion of natural reason of blessedness through morality appears again and again. Without great risk, therefore, our thirteen- and fourteen-year-old confirmed boys and girls cannot be entrusted to these schools. We would therefore be glad if there were a Lutheran high school in every larger city. In any case, a preacher should keep an eye on such students who attend the high schools of our country and warn them repeatedly of the dangers threatening them. And wherever Lutherans notice that the Bible and its teachings are being attacked in the state schools, they should protest, for these are schools that are maintained precisely with their taxes. The Christian religion should not and cannot find a place in state schools, but neither can the religion of the lodges and the false doctrines of the mockers of religion. F. B.

Are large church bodies dangerous to doctrine? That is what the Reformed "Guardian" asserts. In a review of the Milwaukee Free Conference, he writes, according to the "Free Church": "Hopefully Missouri will remain firm. If then nothing comes of the union of the churches, so much the better. This would be better even if they were united in doctrine. Missouri is already much too large not to be dangerous to doctrine. In a large universal church, doctrine will never be preserved pure. That is why God himself has always faithfully seen to it that large churches split. He wants them to be small, weak, and puny, that he may be their strength and help in trouble. And if all nine were completely united in doctrine, and if this doctrine were completely pure, then it would be much better for Missouri to split again than for all nine to become one organization. Of course, none of them will believe that; all of them will want visible unity. So God will have to see to the opposite. In order that they may desist from their foolish construction, he must again and again confuse their language." - The "Watchman" does not know the purpose of the free conferences, by which not a larger church body is to be formed, but unity and communion of faith are to be established. As for the "watchman's" judgment on large church bodies, they are, however, a standing danger to the purity of doctrine, if (as is the case with the Calvinistic communities) they have legislative and judicial power over the individual churches.

is conceded to my congregations. The Presbyterians, with their revision of the confession, are an example of this: the minority submits here, because disobedience would mean loss of church property. But that deliberative bodies, such as the Missouri Synod and the other synods of the Synodal Conference, should, eo ipso, because they are large, be dangerous to doctrine, is false, nor does it find confirmation in experience. We believe that it is by a faithful adherence and co-operation and diligent intercourse of all true Lutherans that the preservation and propagation of pure doctrine is promoted. F. B.

On the **doctrinal position of the General Council,** Fr. Sieker writes in the "Zeugen und Anzeiger" of 6 December: "At the time of the founding of the General Council, it was clear to the leading men that they could not remain in union with the -General Synod' without denying the 'faith'. Under their leadership, several synods left and founded this body with a proper confession of the full faith of the Lutheran Church. They distinctly separated from the 'General Synod' for the sake of the truth of the Most High God. Their present descendants recognize the necessity that all the doctrines of our Lutheran Church, that is, the doctrines of the faith once given to the saints, must be discussed in order to achieve unity. And - for a long time and also this time - the General Council is in full church fellowship with the 'General Synod/. It alternates with the same 'fraternal' representation and has entered into communal work in the field of inner and heathen mission. In the field of 'inner mission' both fellowships have agreed that where one works, the other keeps aloof. This seems wise and right in the eyes of men. But if 'Lutheran' Christians have settled in a place, who still know why the Pennsylvania and other synods have separated from the 'General Synod', and cannot perceive at all that things have become much better in regard to the Lutheran confession in the same, and now want to be served by what they believe to be a more faithful pastor - then they would have to put up with the notice: We have made an agreement with the General Synod that you must adhere to their pastor. Must not the souls then be led astray from their fellowship and their faith? In the field of the heathen mission, the General Council has made a pastor who has always belonged to the General Synod the leader of this work. Only very dull objections have been made to this impropriety. -Actually the head should be where the body is/, said a prominent Doctor of the Concil. But now the body of the Gentile Mission is in the Conciliar, and the head in the 'General Synod'. The editor of the -Lutheran Church Gazette', who testified against this, as well as against other disagreeable things, must put up with public rebuke. This, however, has always been the case. The prophet Elijah must be the confounder of Israel. The makers of the union between Jehovah and Baal, the rulers of the people, are those who preach peace. To this day, the General Synod, in its leading papers, fights every expression of the faithful Lutheran faith, defends as Christian the disgraceful war of faith with the sects, and stands in conscious opposition to the full confession of the Lutheran Church in doctrine and practice. And the General Council holds fraternal communion with her! Which is right - the former separation or the present fellowship? " F. B.

We do not agree with some practices. Thus the German "Luth. Kirchenblatt," which is published by a number of pastors of the General Council, declares in regard to the practice which is tolerated in the General Council. The pieces,

The main reasons for the paper's justified criticism are: that pastors of the General Council hold fellowship with pastors of other churches who advocate a false doctrine of Sunday and help to promote the introduction of the unevangelical Sunday obligation; furthermore, that Lutheran pastors in the Council, who even hold offices of trust in the Council, belong to lodges and even entice young men of their congregation to join the Masonic Lodge. It is remarked in regard to this in the paper, "The new English Synod of New York and New England, last year, by its Constitution, had forbidden pastors to belong to such a society. Other ecclesiastical papers ask in astonishment: Why only the pastors? In Pennsylvania they know how to answer that." - Now, when in 1867 the delegates of our Wisconsin Synod demanded of the whole General Convention a round answer to the question, why the Convention would not declare the lodges forbidden to every Christian, we could receive no other answer than: We cannot. (E. L. G. B.)

The "Sendbote" of 9 December writes of **Baptist baptism**: "It says: The characteristic principle of the Baptists is not the practice of immersion, as is sometimes erroneously assumed. In this doctrine they agree with the Greek Church, the Anglican Church, the Disciples, and other smaller communions. In the Greek Church, immersion of infants is practiced as a rule. The Anglican rubric prescribes the immersion of infants, except when the parents affirm it that the child is not able to bear it. The distinguishing characteristic of Baptists from others is the baptism (by immersion) of believers only. We practice immersion because Christ commanded it; we perform baptism on believers only because Christ so taught; we limit church membership to immersed believers because that is the only legitimate inference from the teaching of the head of the church and the practice of the apostolic churches. It is safe to follow New Testament doctrine and practice; it is dangerous to depart from it, as is abundantly evident from the history of the Christian church." - According to Scripture, only God infallibly knows believers. But this prerogative the Baptists also arrogate to themselves, when they insist that their baptism is "the baptism of believers only." As for the difference between Baptists and Lutherans in the question, "Who shall be baptized?" it does not consist in the fact that Lutherans baptize people who reject the grace offered, while Baptists see to it that the person baptized believes, but in the fact that Baptists make the existence of faith dependent on the confession of the mouth, while Lutherans believe that in holy baptism God also produces faith in the hearts of children who cannot yet confess with the mouth. The Baptists papistically reckon the confession of the mouth to be the essence of faith, but to the Lutherans, wherever it is sincere, it is a fruit of faith. From time to time the "Sendbote" (and all Baptist papers that have come under our eyes) boasts that infant baptism is falling away more and more. On December 2 he writes: "The practice of so-called infant baptism - infant sprinkling - is in constant decline in America. The attempts to justify it biblically are becoming fewer and fewer. In certain infant-baptizing circles, the retention of the time-honored custom is advocated almost solely on sentimental, aesthetic, and other extra-biblical grounds." The fact is that the "Messenger" of last year complained bitterly of the small number of baptisms among Baptists. But he is lying to his "signers" when he tries to make them believe it,

that infant baptism is in "steady decline" among Lutherans. Parents who adhere to the Lutheran Church and do not have their children baptized do not exist among us. F. B.

Methodism and Lutheranism. The "Christliche Apologete" of December 9 writes: "In Berlin a theological professor lectured on the significance of Methodism in church history. This is certainly just as new as the fact that the -Evangelische Kirchliche Anzeiger* expresses itself in the following appreciative words: "Surprising to many was the proof that Lutheranism was translated into Anglo-Saxon by Wesley. We hope that it will soon be possible for the penetrating researcher to communicate his results to German science on a larger scale. The justice in judgment of the outspoken Lutheran, free from any bias for English, revealed his broad view and his genuinely Christian disposition.* It is gratifying that finally, on Wesley's 200th anniversary, German theologians are beginning to shake off the bias against Wesley and Methodism and to exercise -justice in judgment*. From the beginning, Methodism has fully and unprejudicedly acknowledged Luther's merit and work, and has been free from the narrow-mindedness and bias that German theologians have exhibited toward Methodism. Wesley's merit was systematically diminished, his importance as a reformer of the 18th century was completely ignored, and his work distorted. This explains the spitefulness with which Methodism is treated from the pulpits of the state church. Even the Lutheranism of free America treats the Methodist Church with the same contempt and bitterness which it is accustomed to apply to the Catholic Church. Of Wesley's importance and merit nothing is known in these circles to this day, and it seems to be reserved for the twentieth century that people in these circles should learn to appreciate and recognize on merit his influence on theology as well as on church and practical life." - Methodism, as the "Apologist" abundantly testifies, is essentially a mixture of law and gospel, justification and sanctification, which is compatible with Pabbism, but not with true Lutheranism and Christianity. But that the "apologist" lacks a clear understanding of what true Christianity and Lutheranism are, is evident from the same number from which we have just quoted. There it says: "On the last day of Thanksgiving, Rabbi Philippson of Cincinnati preached the sermon of Thanksgiving in the Fifth Presbyterian Church of this city. Several years ago the late Rabbi Wise was invited to deliver a lecture on 'Moses and the Pentateuch* before the Methodist preachers' meeting in Cincinnati, and most readily accepted the invitation. Many similar. Many similar approaches between Jews and Christians in our country, which have had no evil consequences, could be cited. On the contrary, it cannot be denied that in recent times there has been a remarkable change of attitude among many Jewish scholars of all countries with respect to the historical Jesus of Nazareth and in their conduct toward Christianity." Then the "Apologist" lets follow several sayings of Reform Jews, in which the piety of JEsu is praised. It is this recognition of JEsu's "piety," which is abundantly found among Reform Jews, Muhammadans, and rationalists, in which the "Apologist" sees a strange change of attitude and conduct toward Christianity. And that Wesley was of the same opinion, for which the "Apologist" brings the following passage from Wesley's diary of April 4, 1737: "I began [in Savannah, Georgia] to speak Spanish.

so that I may be able to talk with the Jews in my parish, some of whom seem to be more like Christ than some who call him "Lord. - But Christianity consists essentially not in being like Christ, but in a poor sinner believing that God forgives his sin for Christ's sake alone. He who does not believe that Christ, the God-man, has fulfilled the law and borne the wrath of God in our place, may praise Jesus as highly as he may, but he is a heathen and has grasped nothing at all of what the gospel and Christianity really are. He who preaches much about the life, suffering, and death of Christ, but only shows how God is angry with sin, or how Christ has left us an example and shown us how we should be minded, has not yet preached the true gospel and Christianity. This happens only when the Pro Nobis, For Us, is attached to every part of Christ's action and suffering. F. B.

An antiseptic altar chalice. The "Lutheran Herald" of December 12 quotes from a secular newspaper: "A justified fear of bacilli has for some time seized many participants in the Protestant communion". In the Catholic Communio sub una, in which the chalice is denied to the laity, the danger of bacilli transmission through the chalice passing from mouth to mouth is naturally excluded. Various American parishes have already decided in favor of the individual chalice for fear of bacilli and in order not to lose parishioners; in Bremen a separate altar chalice has been introduced for each pew; the Greenfield Congregational Church in Bradford has recently decided to celebrate Holy Communion only sub una, without the chalice. Of course the Catholic papers dwell on the fact that the Bacillus is suggesting a return to 'Roman' practice; and the Protestants object to it, calling it 'ancient Christian'. But now, as we gather from the -voices from Maria Laach', salvation comes from the North. An infectious altar chalice has been invented by Mr. Henrik Leßner of Slagelse (Denmark). The drinking surface of the chalice is covered with antiseptic parchment, which can be renewed by the clergyman for each communicant, as the parchment is fixed on a roll in the chalice itself. The overflowing wine does not go back into the chalice, but runs through a tube under the foot of the chalice. The Lißner chalice is patent pending in Denmark, Germany and Norway. In the meantime, however, the Danish Ministry for Church and Education has already issued a 'hygienic-antiseptic circular' to the bishops, in which the possibility of infection through the usual chalice is discussed and strict hygienic regulations are proclaimed. Despite all this, as has happened many times in England, parishioners will refuse to drink from the chalice for all. In many cases fear of contagion has depressed the intrinsic value of the celebration." - If the bacillus argument impresses superstitious papists and suffices for their mutilated celebration of the Lord's Supper, we are not surprised. It is the best of all the arguments which papists put forward for the celebration sub una. But it is an incomprehensible folly and delusion of Satan when Protestants, out of foolish fear of bacilli, give away one of the clearest words of God, or allow themselves to be deprived of the blessing of the Sacrament. F. B.

Faith healers and the courts. On October 13, in the New York Court of Appeals, a faith healer who had let his child die of pneumonia was convicted of "manslaughter. On November 17, however, the Ohio Supreme Court ruled in favor of the parents in a very similar case. In New York, there is a law which allows parents and guardians to

"to provide minors with food, shelter, *medical attendance*, etc." No such law exists in Ohio. In Ohio, too, the charge was manslaughter, and the acquittal was "on the ground that no law had been violated." The Eddyists and Dowieites, like the Mormons, now cry out about compulsion of belief. But the state cannot be denied the power to make the determination that minors must be attended by a physician approved by the state. In free America, the state allows everyone to think and believe what he wants. But it does not follow that every man may do anything he pleases. F. B.

II. Abroad.

Reunion of the Breslau and Immanuel Synods. The "A. E. L. K." rejoices: "A message of joy comes from the Lutheran Church in Prussia: there will be peace between the Breslau and Immanuel Synods." The "Kirchenblatt" of the Breslau Synod and the "Ev.-luth. Sonntagsblatt" of the Immanuel Synod bring this news under the heading: "A good message" and conclude it with the words: "We are sure that all true friends of the Lutheran Church are grateful to the Lord that he has led the negotiations to this peaceful outcome, whereby the complete healing of the riff is to be hoped for." The "Old Faith" remarks on this: "The words are spoken from our hearts. If it is indeed possible to close the rift completely and thereby heal an evil wound in the body of our Lutheran Church, then we stand before a victory of Reformation truth which not only moves us to heartfelt thanksgiving, but which also entitles us to joyful hopes. A free church which, for the Lord's sake, tramples down discord and, on the basis of the Scriptural confession, offers itself the hand of peace, still has a future among our German people. A highly placed clergyman within the Prussian Union has said, 'The Lutheran Church is crumbling!' Thank God that we may say, 'The Lutheran Church is not crumbling.' The Lutheran Church is gathering!' The reunion of Immanuel and Breslau will be one of the most important steps of the Lutheran unification work. May the Lord of the Church bring all to a blessed end!" Yes, so must every true friend of the Lutheran Church speak, if it is really a matter of unification in truth between the Breslauers and Jmmanuelites. But what are the facts? At the General Synod of Breslau in 1860 a dispute broke out about the church government, Father Diedrich von Jabel claimed: in the church only the office of preaching, not the church government, is of divine foundation. The Oberkirchenkollegium, on the other hand, claimed that the church government was not juris humani, but juris divini. No decision was made by the General Synod in 1860. The following year (1861) Diedrich and his congregation broke away from the supervision of the Oberkirchenkollegium. A number of pastors declared for Diedrich and also accused the Oberkirchenkollegium of false teaching. Congregations were torn apart, counter-altars erected, and under the leadership of Diedrich and Father Ehlers, the Immanuel Synod was formed in July 1864. Several months later the Oberkirchenkollegium, of which Dr. Huschke was the director, submitted its doctrinal position to the General Synod for adoption in the "Oeffentlichen Erklärung wegen der streitigen Lehren von der Kirche, dem Kirchenregiment und den Kirchenordnungen" (Public Declaration on the Disputed Doctrines of the Church, the Church Government, and the Church Ordinances). In it was taught that the office and powers of the church government were of divine right, and that obedience was due to all its ordinances which were not in themselves sinful. Although this "Public Declaration" was not unanimously approved by the General Synod of 1864, it was

(68 against 19), the Synod nevertheless professed by word and deed the doctrine of the High Church College, which declared that it could not conduct its ministry in any other way according to Scripture and symbol than in the sense of the "Public Declaration". Later, too, this doctrine was adhered to, although the "Public Declaration" was not formally adopted. The opposite view - that was without doubt the interest here - was to be indifferentistically tolerated. This was clearly expressed in the resolution of the General Synod of 1898: "As obligatory publica doctrina we admit nothing other than the Holy Scriptures and the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church; We do not regard the differences of opinion which have arisen on this basis of confession as separating the Church, but as questions on which a unanimous understanding of the Lutheran Church as a whole has not yet been reached, although we believe that we have made a substantial gain in ecclesiastical knowledge in the way we have followed and fixed in the 'Public Declaration'." In other words, while the Breslauers teach and adhere to the doctrine that the church government is juris divini, they also tolerate the opposite view. (A similar decision was taken by the Breslauers in the previous year, 1902). That the Breslauers, however, intended to persist in their old doctrine of church government is evident from a resolution of the same General Synod of 1898, which also plays an important role in the union between Breslauers and Immanuelites. The same reads, as follows: "According to the Holy Scriptures and the Lutheran symbols, it is God's clear will that the Church of Jesus Christ, in order that it may fulfill its divine calling in the world, should not be without a visible organization, not without an office of church government, and not without certain order binding the individual ministers and members of it." To this resolution, which upholds the old heresy of the Breslauers, and clearly teaches that the office of church government is a divine order, and that the by-laws of this office are binding, - to this resolution the Immanuel Synod at its meeting of this year professed itself, and that (as the seniors of this Synod assured the Breslau High Church College) "unanimously and expressly." According to this, then, the Jmmanuelites would have completely surrendered their former position, and between the Breslau and Immanuel Synods a real unity (admittedly not in truth, but in falsehood) would have come about. But this, too, is only a sham! In the resolution which the Jmmanuelites passed in the matter of unification at their last synod on October 2, 1903, they refer to the fact that the two synods were in agreement. October 1903, they refer to the declaration of the Breslauers of the previous year (1902), which formally denies all and any ecclesiastical validity to the "Public Declaration" of 1864, and the Jmmanuelites present the matter as if not they, but the Breslauers had revealed their position and that for this reason they had dropped the accusation of false teaching against the Breslauers. The decision reads: "After the High Church College has presented the decisions of the General Synods of 1898 and 1902 as the only valid judgment of their church in the disputed questions, in such a way that the 'Public Declaration' of 1864 has neither the validity of a confession nor any normative position within their church fellowship, the Immanuel Synod drops the accusation of false doctrine against the Breslau Synod. Thereby we recognize all previous obstacles to church and communion between us as removed, and now look forward with joy to a complete reunion of the two church communions." In the "Neue lutherische Kirchenzeitung" (New Lutheran Church Newspaper) a "Huschkeaner" remarks on this: "In response to this, the Immanuel Synod has just decided to

to retract the accusation of false doctrine against us after the 'Public Declaration' has been removed. But this does not mean that the 'Public Declaration' contains false doctrine, and that therefore the separation of the Immanuel Synod from Breslau was a justified one. If our church accepts this without reservation, it thereby tacitly permits a denunciation of the 'Public Declaration'. But that would be a crying injustice, for the 'Public Declaration' contains no false doctrine, but biblical and symbolic truth." The Breslau Oberkirchenkollegium, which today leads the same doctrine as Anno 1864, declared itself satisfied with this! On October 22 of this year a negotiation took place in Breslau between the Oberkirchenkollegium and the seniors of the ImmanuelSynod, which, on the basis of the above conflicting resolutions of the Breslau and Immanuel Synods, "led to a" [as the "Good News" says] "pleasing result." It was agreed that a commission of the Oberkirchenkollegium, together with one of the seniors of the Immanuel Synod, should conduct the necessary negotiations on the spot concerning the most suitable form of reconnection. After Easter 1904, perhaps the Immanuel Synod will decide to dissolve itself and the pastors and congregations will definitively reconnect with the Breslau Synod. It is obvious that, unfortunately, even in this union it is not a question of real and true unity in the spirit, but of mutual deception and indifferent declaration of differences. "One lets everyone think what he wants, and outwardly joins together over the corpse or the grave of the 'Public Declaration,'" says the Huschkeaner in the cited church newspaper. The Breslauers give the deceptive appearance of recanting, and the Immanuelites of abandoning their position, and with this appearance both sides are satisfied. Last year the Breslau Synod numbered 51,600 souls, 64 parishes, and 75 "ordained ministers," and the Immanuel Synod numbered 5300 souls, with 13 "ordained ministers." F. B.

The Chemnitz Conference met in Dresden on November 3. One of the main topics of discussion was the planned church merger. In a resolution, it expressed its gratitude "for the fact that, according to the resolutions of the Eisenach Church Conference of June of this year, the preservation of the confessional status of the Lutheran regional churches, the consideration of the confessions in the spiritual care of the diaspora and the colonies, as well as the non-binding nature of the resolutions have been established. That the Chemnitz Conference, however, does not trust the peace and that it is not quite comfortable with the whole matter, is evident from the request expressed in the same resolution to the Ministers in Evangelicis and to the Landesconsistorium at Dresden, to work towards the following: "1. That the Evangelical Lutheran church communities in the "united church territory" no longer be deprived of the rights of independent churches, and that the accession to these Evangelical Lutheran church communities not be made more difficult for fellow believers moving in from Lutheran regional churches; 2. That the order of the presidency already now takes place in the sense of a regular change among the church governments involved; 3. That an orderly Lutheran naval chaplaincy, namely from the larger naval stations and squadrons, is established in view of the numerous Lutherans also from Saxony in the navy; 4. That in the regulation of the spiritual care of the diaspora, the colonies, as well as in the sailors' and emigrants' mission, any impairment of Lutheran associations remains excluded". On this the Saxon "Free Church" remarks: "When, after the political changes of the year 1866, the Lutherans in Saxony were able to

became aware of the danger the Lutheran Church in Saxony was threatened with through its close political connection with united Prussia, they demanded that Prussian (united) garrison pastors be sent to the Prussian garrisons in Saxony, but not, as had happened, that the united soldiers be led to the Lutheran altars. This was an absolutely reasonable and necessary demand to clarify the difference in confession between the Lutheran and the Uniate Church. But it was rejected with a threatening reference to the fact that whoever was so narrow-minded would have to bear the consequences himself. Does one really believe that now, after 35 years, since frequent mingling between Lutherans and Uniate has taken place through freedom of movement, and the admission of Uniate to the 'Lutheran' altars has become just as much the unobjectionable rule as the admission of regional church 'Lutherans' to uniate altars, the request expressed under 3 has any chance of success? " F. B.

The Lutheran Church in Alsace. In the "Old Faith" of November 27, a correspondent from Alsace writes: "On the Reformation holiday, it is obvious to keep an eye on the state of the Lutheran Church in our country. The result is not encouraging. The old are leaving, and the replacement of young forces who are willing to stand freely and openly on the ground of Scripture and the Lutheran confession is sparse. On a small scale, what is not infrequently true elsewhere is repeated in Alsace, namely, that Lutheranism is thrown back into the countryside, that it is denied access to larger and smaller cities, because there, as a rule, liberalism or a mediating direction is preferred, in accordance with the demands of the bourgeoisie. The current to the left is favored by the church authorities. The President of the Directorate of the Church of the Augsburg Confession, in his inaugural address, has declared it to be his highest duty to do strict justice to the various ecclesiastical tendencies. Dr. Curtius intends to be above all an administrative officer. 'No administration can create the living spirit that awakens religious life.' Let it then be above all things beflifsen, where this spirit shows itself and how it shows itself, not to inhibit the free play of its forces!' The 'free play of forces/ seems somewhat peculiar in the mouth of a man who leads a regional church of the Augsburg Confession and whose primary concern should therefore be the preservation of this confession. Whoever knows the personal position of the new director - he is close to the subjectivism of the 'Christliche Wel' - will, of course, be less surprised. On our side one finds mostly despondency, the joy of attack and the spirit of enterprise are missing, often only the 'fist in the sack' is made. The younger generation of theologians is too much under the spell of the Strasburg Faculties, which suck the ecclesiastical marrow out of the bones and instill in its place the spirit of 'presuppositionless' science." - Dr. Curtius, the new President of the Directorate of the Church of the Augsburg Confession in Alsace-Lorraine, has - as Father Horning says in his "Theologische Blätter" - publicly spoken and written in the spirit of the Moderns, and has also taken part in the meetings of the friends of the modern-liberal 'Christian Worlds'. The declaration in his inaugural address of May of this year: "Strict justice against the various ecclesiastical tendencies is our highest duty" therefore only means: In Alsace-Lorraine, pleasure and light must be created especially for the liberals. The same slogan everywhere: in Prussia, Holstein, Alsace. The scoffers of the "Christian world," who deny the doctrine of Christ's person and work and basically every part of the second and third articles, raise their heads everywhere. And all the while the positive are despondent and despondent. Why? Because they

have left the ground of the infallible word of God. He who believes, but only he who believes that he has in the Holy Scriptures the infallible Word of God, is able to offer defiance to all enemies.

F. B.

The "fifth Prussian General Synod" held its meeting (seventeen full sessions) in Berlin at the end of October. The main subject of the negotiations was the question of the professors' forum, on which a decision was reached on October 31. The committee appointed by the General Synod had submitted the following motion: "The General Synod unanimously confesses the revelation of God in Christ Jesus, crucified and risen, as the foundation of the life of the church. It recognizes the difficulties that exist for contemporary theology in asserting and defending biblical Christianity and considers freedom of research to be an indispensable condition for overcoming them. She expresses her gratitude to all theologians who help to affirm and defend the evangelical faith through their work. But she declares that the Church cannot bear that the principle of the equality of the directions be extended to the opposition of the naturalistic and the Christian worldview. In deploring the arousal which has occurred and which has confused the believing community, she expresses the certainty that even the present struggles within theological science will eventually lead to the new substantiation and deepening of the unchanging truth of the Gospel. It asks the state government not to appoint theologians who do not recognize the saving acts of God and the revelatory character of sacred Scripture as the foundation of the church and of the assurance of salvation. It declares it necessary, in the interest of the Church as well as of theology, that there be no lack of professors who stand firmly in the faith of the Church in any theological faculty, especially for the major subjects. It gratefully acknowledges that the Protestant Oberkirchenrath has promised, in cooperation with the Minister of Culture, to effectively support suitable clergy in taking up the academic profession, and considers it desirable if academic teachers have previously served in a parish office of the church. The General Synod adheres to the desire of the General Synodal Board to participate in the evaluation of the docents to be appointed." In the plenum, however, it was not possible to get the motion through without considerable weakening. The "Reformation" writes: "The most divergent views were when the commission motion on the filling of theological professorships came up for negotiation. On Reformation Day the battle was fought and ended with a decisive victory for the positives. The proceedings were rich in surprises. New motions appeared again and again which were intended to weaken the positive demands, but the majority remained firm; it accepted changes of a formal nature, but always knew how to insert the commission motions in such a way that they had to be voted on. And so the following motion was finally adopted in a roll-call vote by 127 votes to 57: With satisfaction, the General Synod has seen from the communication of the Evangelical High Church Council of October 8 of this year that he appreciates the great interest of the Church in filling theological professorships, that he has entered into consultation with the General Synodal Board about suitable ways of safeguarding this interest, and that he has also, in conjunction with him and in the direction of the Commission's motions, suggested to the fourth ordinary General Synod an attempt to make it easier for academically capable clergymen to try out for the academic teaching office. In view of the concerns expressed by several Provincial Synods, the General Synod unanimously confesses Christ Jesus, the only begotten Son of God, the Crucified and Risen One for us, the one and only Mediator of our Church.

Salvation. It trusts that only men who stand in the faith and confession of the Son of God will be appointed professors of theology. The General Synod is convinced that the difficulties existing for contemporary theology in asserting and defending biblical Christianity can only be overcome if the freedom of scientific research is in harmony with the commitment to the facts of salvation. - She expresses her gratitude to all theologians who help to affirm and defend the evangelical faith through their work. But it declares that the Church cannot bear it when the principle of the equality of views is extended even to the opposition of the naturalistic and the Christian worldviews. - In deploring the aversions which have occurred and which confuse the believing community, she expresses the certainty that even the present struggles within theological science will eventually lead to a new substantiation and deepening of the unchangeable truth of the Gospel. The General Synod, referring to the decision of the Commission of the Fourth Ordinary General Synod, adheres to the desire of the General Synodal Board to participate in the evaluation of the docents to be appointed in appropriate cases". The "Reformation" concludes its report with the words: "The fifth General Synod can look back on its activity with satisfaction. Its majority has remained firm and
has passed resolutions which we hope will bring rich blessings to the Lutheran Church." In fact, however, it is a defeat and a compromise. The original motion also advocated "freedom of research," but was rejected because it was not liberal enough. The substitute adopted allows the profesfors to fight against divine truth to the point of naturalism, exclusive. This is not a victory of truth, but a mediation between Christ and Belial. The "Old Faith" writes: "It did not come to the determined testimony for the truth of the Christian faith, which one had expected from it in ecclesiastical circles. The negotiations were marked by compromise. The Oberkirchenrath lavished, the parties lavished, the leading personalities lavished. And the end was as a rule a difficult birth, which not infrequently brought a stillborn child into the world. This character of the Synod came out most characteristically in the debates on the so-called 'professorial motion,' which may be called the real climax of the session." Of the Commission, consisting of 21 members, which was to prepare the way for the Synod to settle this question, the same paper writes: "The Commission had a difficult task. All the opposites which comprise the General Synod, the theological, the ecclesiastical and the personal, clashed in its bosom. The middle party wanted the freedom of theological science to be preserved under every condition. The confessionalists showed little desire to enter into an open battle over confession. The Oberkirchenrath did not intend to be dissuaded from his traditional position of allowing the professors unrestricted freedom of movement and, on the other hand, not allowing his students, the adherents of modern theology in the ranks of the clergy, to be reprimanded. And only the positive union, led by Stöcker, showed a firm backbone. Here, however, courtly and ecclesiastical regimental influences, begrudging success to the ostracized court preacher, intervened again, and completed the picture of synodal confusion." The saddest part was played by the representatives of the "August Conference." The "Old Faith" says: "The confessional group disavowed the program of their own conference and brought.

more governmental than confessional, introduced the independent motion that the General Synod express confidence that only men who stand in the faith and confession of Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, be appointed professors of theology." Further, "The confessional group did not show itself equal to its task in any respect." Instead of forcefully advocating the demands formulated by the 'August Conference' without any courtly consideration, it fell back into the old unfruitful role of a 'voluntary governmental sleeve troop'. In the interest of our Lutheran cause we regret this attitude most painfully. But there is nothing to be done about it. The supporters of the positive Union, newly united under Stoecker's leadership, have placed themselves at the head of the movement. In the history of the Confessionals, however, the number of missed opportunities is increased by a new one." That it came to the adoption of a motion against the liberals at all was the merit of Dr. Stoecker. The "Old Faith" says: "The real decisive factor, however, was Stoecker's courageous and decisive appearance. He was the only speaker on the right who was equal to the vacillating situation. With sharp and yet not hurtful words, he theoretically as well as practically exposed the core of the whole question: revelation or development? Fact or legend? Sole rule of modern theology or validity of the church's common faith? National church or separation?" The liberal "Christliche Welt" (Christian World) also judged in the same way: "The stronger one, whom many followed, was this time again Stöcker. We say: again. For six years ago Stöcker was as good as gone, and he was so above all among his friends. Without a sound his name disappeared behind new authorities. Now he has risen and is once again a member of the General Synodal Board, the only synodal body of public ecclesiastical importance. Depending on one's attitude towards Stöcker, one will admire or deplore this rare and strange success. One sees what a personality is capable of, or rather what an orator is capable of. The orator Stöcker is sure of his success everywhere. Everything he does is essentially rhetoric, even what he exaggerates. And this man thrives on fruitful exaggerations." Unfortunately, however, Dr. Stöcker also belongs to the group of theologians who deny the inerrancy of the Bible and are therefore no match for the liberals. Of Stöcker the "Christliche Welt" writes: "He himself, in an issue of the 'Reformation' which was circulated at the Synod, admitted that legends and fabulous elements are present in the biblical prehistory, and that we must proceed to acquaint the congregations with them. What a confusion! It cannot possibly make an impression." - That the resolution adopted will have no further consequences is self-evident. The "Christliche Welt" says: "The resolutions of the Synod will probably change nothing. Even the appointment of theological professors will remain as it was. If the minister looks through the motions and then considers the manner of their synodal treatment, and in so doing also learns how for 24 hours one came close to preparing a silent burial for these motions, the course of events will not exactly have a shattering effect on him. It means something that a third of the synod was simply not to be had for the usual censuring procedure." Others have called the decision a "first-class burial," a "slap in the face." - The third party that voted against the professors' motions consisted largely of the members of the "Evangelical Association". Also voting "no" were Oberhofprediger Dryander-Berlin, Generalsuperintendent Döblin-Danzig, Consistorialpräsident Dr. v. Dörnberg-Königsberg i. Pr., Prof. Dr. Benrath-Königsberg i. Pr., Consistorialrath Dr. Claaß-Danzig, Franken-Schalke, the professors Dr. Haupt-Halle, Kaftan-Berlin, Dr. Kahl-Berlin, Kautzsch-Halle, Dr. Kawerau-

Breslau, Dr. Loofs-Halle, furthermore General Superintendent Köhler-Berlin, Consistorialrath Dr. Lackner - Königsberg i. Pr., Consistorialpräsident Meyer-Danzig, Oberlandesgerichtspräsident v. Plehrve - Königsberg i. Pr., Consistorialrath SchmidtBerlin, Landesgerichtspräsident Dr. v. d. Trenk-Jnsterburg. On this the "Old Faith" remarks: "Hitherto it had always been possible to hide the sharp contrasts within the Prussian Landeskirche behind a colorless resolution. Now, however, the cover has fallen, and it becomes evident what has long been no longer a secret to those who look deeper, that the friends and patrons of modern theology are to be sought not only in the ranks of professors and their students, but that they have already occupied the highest levels of the Landeskirch hierarchy." - To all theological tendencies light and air,-on this principle, as in the past, so also in the future, the officials of the Church as well as of the State will act in Prussia. F. B.

The monumental memorial house erected in **honor of Melanchthon** in Breiten was inaugurated with the participation of the Grand Duke of Baden and the King of Württemberg from October 19 to 21. It rises exactly on the spot where Melanchthon saw the light of day. The plan for this tribute to Melanchthon was suggested as early as 1895 by Dr. Nikolaus Müller, Professor of Theology at the University of Berlin. An appeal was issued, which brought rich donations, so that in the following year the architects Vollmer and Jassop could be commissioned to deliver the necessary plans and drafts. They were executed under the supervision of the architect Jung. Furthermore, the Berlin sculptor Fritz Heinemann delivered seven statues of the Reformers for the Memorial Hall. Above the windows of the upper floor is the inscription: "In honor of God, in memory of Melanchthon, erected by Protestant Christianity."

The **21 German universities,** with their teachers and admitted listeners, comprise a contingent of about 50,000 persons or, to be more exact, 49,575. The total number of teachers amounts to about 3023. Among them are 1153 full professors, 699 associate professors, 94 honorary professors and reading members of academies, 907 private lecturers, repetiteurs, assistants, 167 language and exercise masters. The learning world at the German universities amounted to 46,552 heads during the summer semester. The total number of enrolled students was 37,813; in addition, 7939 persons were entitled to attend lectures. Among the enrolled 37,813 students are 2197 Protestant and 1580 Catholic theologians, 10,747 lawyers, cameralists and forestry specialists, 6948 physicians and pharmacists, 15,205 philosophers, philologists, mathematicians, etc. - The number of Protestant theology students in Germany in the summer semester of 1903 was 2207. Berlin had 268, Bonn 74, Breslau 61, Erlangen 155, Gießen 74, Göttingen 98, Greifswald 117, Halle 329, Heidelberg 62, Jena 50, Kiel 41, Königsberg 82, Leipzig 262, Marburg 129, Rostock 42, Strasbourg 73, Tübingen 290. - Catholic theology was studied by 1580, namely in Bonn 311, Breslau 299, Freiburg 205, Munich 161, Münster 300, Tübingen 191, Würzburg 113.

A flowering of scientific theology. In a printed lecture on "Baptism and the Lord's Supper in Paul," Die. Heitmüller from Göttingen draws the following parallel to the Lord's Supper as a religious-historical custom of the ancient Aztecs: "Prisoners of war who were chosen for sacrifice received the name of the god Tezcatlizoca, wore his clothes, were provided for a time with all attributes and surrounded with divine honors, until on the day of the feast they were slaughtered in the crudest manner and consumed by the worshippers. What follows

a whole number of examples of theological customs from Mexican, Thracian, Arabic and other religions, with which it is to be shown that the Lord's Supper, as Paul knew it, is a 'new sapling on an old branch of the tree of the history of religion of mankind'." - Research in the history of religion wants to show the natural origin of Christianity and its doctrines. Heitmüller's achievement is "a fair sample" of how it proceeds.

F- B.

Count Hoensbroech passed the following judgment on the **last Catholic Day in Cologne in** the magazine "Deutschland": "As a religious rally, it was a distorted image of Christianity with its external splendor, with its banquets, with the ostentatious processions and excerpts, with the self-aggrandizing speeches. Imagine Christ in this 'milieu', for instance, in the midst of the two purple- or drag-adorned 'eminences' and the bishops dressed in silk and draped with gold chains. Party-politically the days on the Rhine were a brilliant army show: The best-disciplined party-despite Social-Democracy-had held a parade which made its power, its unity, its ruthlessness stand out powerfully. But let us not speak of religion, at least not of Christianity, in connection with such events; let us call the thing by its proper name: political party congress under abuse of religion."

(E. K. Z.)

The "historical" method of modern theology. From the "Reformation" we share the opinion of Decan Römer, who writes: "More than a decade ago I once spoke to an enthusiastic and important student of Ritschl and Harnack about the criticism that Robert Kübel had made of the 'Presentation of Christianity and Luther's Theology in Harnack's Dogmengeschichte III'. ('Neue kirchl. Zeitschrift' 1891, H. 1.) I said that here, after all, the proof was furnished that Harnack thoroughly misrepresented Luther's theology and piety in essential points. He replied compassionately that Kübel had not even understood that much, that Harnack did not want to draw the 'historical' Luther in the literal, philistine sense of the word, but rather drew a picture of Luther in such a way as his figure still remains valuable today according to our present religious knowledge. I believe that the student understood his master correctly. When Harnack assigns to the 'historian' the 'highest task' of 'ascertaining' what is valuable and enduring in what was in the past, he thereby unconsciously places dogmatics, and of course his dogmatics, above history: for only from a certain dogmatic standpoint and according to a certain dogmatic measure can it be ascertained what in what has historically been has the right and claim to be called 'enduringly valuable'. In the characterization of Luther's doctrine and piety, Ritsch's dogmatics was authoritative for Harnack, and who would want to prevent him from evaluating and valuing Luther from his theological standpoint? But what is significant about Harnack's presentation is that he does not first draw a historical picture of Luther that is as objective as possible, and then, in a dogmatic critique, emphasizes what, in his judgment, is 'valuable and lasting' about him; Rather, the power that both Luther's personality and Ritschl's theology exert over him makes him present the historical picture itself entirely in dogmatic light, and therein lies the poetic moment that captivates the like-minded person, makes him sympathetic to the picture drawn in advance, and disposes him to everything rather than to the question of whether the beautiful painting is also accurately drawn. So it was already with the master himself, with Ritschl. Who shared his dogmatic point of view, for him the history of the painting was the most important thing.

In his opinion, the view presented by his 'History of Pietism' is such an immediate confirmation of Ritschl's conception of Christianity and piety that he involuntarily believed the picture, even without its individual features, yes, even without Ritschl's popular definition of Pietism having corresponded to what one might expect from an objective historical account". - According to Herodotus, the first duty of a historian is that he should faithfully report. *Ἐχώ* οφείλω *λέγειν τα λεγάμενα,* - this was his principle. But if

When Harnack and Ritschl write history, their intention is not to report faithfully what their heroes really did and said, but to impute to them their own thoughts and ways of acting. Just as in our time the task of modern exegesis is often seen in interpreting Genesis 1, for example, according to the "results" of science, i. e., in subordinating the thoughts of science to Moses, so Harnack calls it history when he uses the historical figures as covers for "modern" men. To construct Harnackians out of the historical material is Harnack's task in history. With this construction they do not begin with Luther, but already with Christ. "Christ - the first Ritschlian", with this motto Harnack approaches the four Gospels, and according to this thought he determines the selection of the material for his picture of Christ. F. B.

The Congress of the Anglican Church met in Bristol. Dressed in his scarlet and purple habit, Bishop Browne presided over the meeting. He mounted the rostrum amid loud cheers. The Free Churches of the city had sent a delegation to the opening ceremony to welcome the assembly in their name as well. The Anglicans put up with this, although they themselves studiously kept away from the congresses of the Free Churches. On the school question the debates were divided. Some were in favor of accommodating the Free Churches, while others spoke with pride and indignation about the Free Church agitation against the existing school law. Only forced will the Episcopalians give up the advantages which the school law affords them. Bishop Gore, who belongs to the ritualistic school, exhorted moderation in the musical and ceremonial ornamentation of the service. In so doing, he enunciated the principle: Ceremonies are made for the sake of man, and not man for the sake of ceremonies. The appearance of the ultra-critical "Encyclopaedia Biblica" within the Anglican Church gave occasion to speak out about modern biblical criticism. But only naturalism was rejected: the effort of criticism to derive the essential content of the Bible from contemporary circumstances. The doctrine of the verbal inspiration and the lack of truth in the Holy Scriptures was also generally abandoned in the Anglican Church. The decline in church attendance and especially the fact that not half as many men as women attend services has been discussed at length. In the free churches things are somewhat better; they can show a full twenty thousand more male church-goers than the state church. Another question concerned the ministerial income of the priests. The "A. G." writes about this: "With the suffering agriculture, the 'rich English benefices' have, with a few exceptions, sunk more and more to quite moderate incomes. And posts, which even in the days of the 'good old days' were only at a medium level, today hardly offer their holders the bare necessities of life. In England there are 14,200 clerical posts. Of these, six thousand, nearly half, have a salary of less than three thousand marks, and among these there are again fourteen hundred and ninety-one with an annual income of not yet three thousand marks.

once two thousand marks. Many posts are almost empty. In the countryside, people are already thinking here and there of increasing the income of the clergy by combining neighboring parishes. This is not the first time that the congress has dealt with this question. This time, too, the Dean of Windsor acted as an advocate for his poor brethren and again recommended the establishment of a central fund. But this proposal never came to fruition. Apparently there is no supreme authority to take up the matter. In England the State is not so closely connected with the Church that it should make it its duty to provide for its clergy. For this purpose its hands are tied by the consideration of the Free Churches. And the bishops certainly have a warm heart for the clergy of their parish. But they have neither the means nor the power to introduce a general measure. Least of all could they themselves be called upon to make great personal sacrifices. Their income, of course, is almost princely. But on the other hand their expenses are immense. The last Archbishop of Canterbury has often told how, in spite of his salary of two hundred thousand marks as Bishop of London, he had first to borrow a few hundred pounds from a friend to effect the removal to Canterbury. And so the striking fact remains that the richest state church in the world has the poorest parishes. " F. B.

The Lutheran Provisional Synod, which met in Paris in November, dealt primarily with the parliamentary proposals for separation of church and state and adopted the following resolutions: "The Synod is well aware that the Church of Christ can exist without the protection of the state. Considering, however, that the practical proposals for separation of Church and State which have become known seek to interfere with every public manifestation of religious life; considering, further, that the very proposals which have been made prove the necessity of orderly relations between Church and State, while these relations are now to be regulated in a purely police manner by a decree of the State; Considering, finally, that, as far as the Lutheran Church is concerned, the relationship has been regulated in the best possible way by the law of 1879, after previous agreement between the representatives of the Church and the State, the Synod expresses the wish that the existing laws remain in force. Should the proposals for separation of church and state nevertheless come up for negotiation in Parliament, let the official representation of the Lutheran Church be heard beforehand by the government." - The injustice of taxing the churchless for ecclesiastical purposes is felt in France neither by the Romans nor by the Reformed and Lutherans. In spite of all opposition on the part of the Church, however, it seems at present that the repeal of the Concordat will be only a question of time. And the Lutherans in France should be happy about this, because for Lutheranism, which wants state and church, spiritual and secular, to be strictly distinguished and separated, the normal state is the Free Church.

F. B.

The former Catholic priest Bourrier in France, whom the Evangelical Federation in Germany has publicly paraded and to whose Los-von-Rom movement he has professed allegiance, denies in his paper *Chrétien Francais* pretty much all fun
the teachings of Christianity. In the "Christliche Welt" of October 15, Bourrier defended himself against all kinds of attacks made on him for this and other reasons. But his own words judge him. He writes: "The main reproach made against me is that I am not orthodox. It was hardly worth the trouble to make such an accusation, since

I am the first to admit this, indeed to have said it often enough. No, I am not orthodox; I have a real horror of all orthodoxies, I suffered too much from them when I was still their victim; my struggle for freedom was so hard that I almost perished from it, and now one demands that I still preach an orthodoxy, whatever it may be? Whoever has gone the way I had to go is cured of all orthodoxy for all time. I cannot emphasize it enough: one does not leave one orthodoxy to submit to another, just as the bird does not escape from its cage to take refuge in another, no matter how large and no matter how colorfully decked out." Of his present position on the Papacy, Bourrier says: "I have spoken of Leo XIII. with admiration; and I think that this beautiful and great spirit deserves such feeling. I have also formerly devoted harsh words to him; for his pontificate is so many-sided, and his personality so great, that one may have the most various, nay, opposite sentiments towards him. But I declare that none of my opponents can prove to me any personal vituperation of this pontiff which has flowed from my pen. I leave my collaborators as much freedom as possible; but I believe I can assure them that they have never exceeded a just measure. Will I also be reproached for my relations with the most learned and pious abbés of the clergy? I do not deny them; they are even more numerous and intimate than I allow to show through in my paper. An archbishop, two bishops, vicars-general and superiors of the great seminaries receive the *Chrétien Francais, and from time to* time feel the need to send their lines to it.

send." Bourrier says of his work among the Roman priests: "When priests ask us for our help to free them, we see in them only unhappy servants who must be helped; we do not give a piece of bread with one hand while the other wants to impose dogma. This explains our successes; without having to use the Huguenot dictionary, which has lost too much favor with the people in France, we have already helped many to freedom who have found peace in the Gospel and claim for themselves the name Christian. Those who wanted to study to become Protestant pastors have been supported by us. Today we can name a dozen pastors who owe their position to us. Now the former priests are to study theology for four years just like the other students. Therefore, the candidates will be less frequent; for at thirty and forty years of age one does not easily submit to such a long period of preparation, and these long years are also a heavy burden for us. Nevertheless, we still support some students, because the pastorate must remain a career open to the most worthy and the best. We leave the religious development of the priests who come to us to their conscience, for we do not presume to guide them, but only to help them. Some of them reject the infallibility of the pope, but retain the infallibility of the conciliar; though we think they stop half-way, we respect their convictions, and have even sent one to the Old Catholic Faculty at Berne. Others exchange the infallibility of the pope and the conciliar with the infallibility of the Bible, which they suppose to be a book dictated by God. This belief, too, we respect; though it is most rare among priests, and falls away very quickly with the first serious studies. But many others, and they are those who recognize Christ as their Saviour and Master, are now living honorably and happily as humble laborers and good family men in a middle-class profession, and they bless us for it, because we have awakened their consciences and brought them out of bondage.

and hypocrisy. Many priests do not want to leave the clergy, because they believe that within Catholicism a powerful current toward the Gospel will form, which will count numerous followers. They seek to free Catholic doctrine more and more from clerical errors and additions. This party exists today as a powerful and numerous one; to it belong the best and most learned among the younger priests. It is enough to mention names like Loisy, Houtin, Klein, Denis, Dabry, Grosjean, Jsarion, Lemire, etc. Ten years ago this party did not exist; indirectly, de *Chrétien Francais* contributed to its creation. When one saw the exodus that was taking place from the Clerus, when my resignation, as well as that of Philippot, Chärbonnel, Vidalot, occupied public opinion, then one understood that one must give the young Clerus hope for a reform and offer a more evangelical spiritual nourishment. There arose, with the help and under the patronage of several bishops, that young party which is pointed out to us with the words: 'Do you see how wrongly you acted when you left the Church!' It is estimated that the number of adherents of Loisy's ideas among the clergy exceeds ten thousand; so strong is this party that Rome dared not interfere with the writings of this new school, and that the Congress at Bourges was able to take place. I could produce a letter from the Abbe Lemire, in which I was invited to take part in the preliminary commission of this congress. We have supported this movement, recommended teachers and books to it; for we believe that with it is the future of France. Since we are convinced that France will never be Huguenot, and yet wish that she may be spared the ruin of atheism, we believe that out of Catholicism itself will come a Church sufficiently evangelical to be our sister, sufficiently Christian to work with us for the salvation of souls and the future of the Kingdom of God. These priests have no more the vocabulary of the Huguenots than we do; but what they write is not unworthy to be set beside the works of the great men of Christendom. God grant that we may soon be freed from that politicizing Church which conspires with generals and great capitalists to restore the priests to government, the same who scarcely four years ago were crying 'Death to the Protestants!' in the streets." Of the victory news of Protestant associations from France, at last, Bourrier says: "One also knows what to make of those 'victory news' which certain associations publish at regular intervals. When one hears them, one thinks that all France is crowding to the Protestant churches. Nothing could be more false than that. I honor the Protestant works of love; I admire the fruitful efforts of Father Robert at Pons. But all this has not yet driven a wedge into the mass-and numerically we are at the same point to-day as we were a century ago, notwithstanding all the great pains and the considerable sums expended. Much was made of a priest who converted his whole parish to Protestantism: another priest came and led all the flock back into the episcopal sheepfold, and the priest who had become a Protestant pastor had to look for a parish elsewhere." - Bourrier did not recognize the basic "damage" of Papism: works-righteousness and rationalism. The movement which he provoked can therefore hardly be called a Christian one. What separates him from the papacy are secondary matters. In all essentials he, like all liberal theologians, agrees with the Papists. Bourrier's paper, *Chrétien Francais* the "Organ of Protestant Reform
in Catholicism," has lost many subscribers this year, so that it cannot be

no longer appears weekly, but only every fourteen days. Many priests have cancelled the paper, because they are now strictly supervised, and many Protestants, because Bourrier is too liberal for them. Those among the resigned priests who openly turn to Protestantism read the *Pretre Converti*, which the former priest J. B. Corneloup has been publishing monthly for five years.

F.B.

The Evangelical Lutheran Synod in Australia - as reported by the Saxon "Freikirche" of 6 December - "held its second general assembly (Synod of Delegates) from 4 to 10 September, namely at Kirchheim near Minyip in the State of Victoria. The paper presented dealt with the subject: That even the pious of the old covenant were saved by faith in the triune God, and therefore by faith in our Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Mary. Whereby it was proved, 1. that the pious of the old covenant knew and believed the doctrine of the holy Trinity; 2. that they knew and believed the doctrine of the Son of God; 3. that they knew and believed the doctrine of the deity of the Messiah or Christ; 4. that they knew and believed the doctrine of the two natures in Christ, the doctrine of the mediatorial office. ... A constitution was also adopted of the general synod, hitherto consisting of two special synods loosely connected, according to which the same shall be called the 'Evangelical Lutheran Synod in Australia,' and shall be composed of the 'Southern (or Western) District of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod in Australia,' embracing the congregations in the State of South Australia, and the 'Eastern District of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod in Australia,' embracing the congregations in the States of Victoria and New South Wales. The Inner Mission in Western Australia, which has so far been carried out by the Southern District alone and which, according to the report of the travelling preacher (Pastor Fischer), has been wonderfully successful, as well as the Inner Mission in Queensland, which the Eastern District has been carrying out since last year with good success, have been taken over by the general Synod and placed under a special Mission Commission; on the other hand, the Heathen Mission, which the first-mentioned District has been carrying out for some time among the Australians at Denial Bay, has remained under the old management. In the matter of the educational institution - the Seminary for Preachers and Teachers at Murtoa in the State of Victoria, which had existed since 1891, closed down at the end of last year - the Synod confessed that it had the sacred duty to take care of the education of preachers and teachers, and gave strength and emphasis to this confession by resolving to take the education of preachers and teachers in hand and to carry it out as a work of the whole Synod, namely, a Grammar School is to be opened first. As to the place where the institution should be carried on, namely, whether at Murtoa or somewhere in South Australia, the decision was left to the individual parishes. The 'Luth. Kirchenbote für Australien', from which we take the above news, and which had hitherto been only a private paper, was elevated to the status of a synodal paper. Father Nickel was elected general presiding officer, and Prof. Gräbner general vice-presiding officer." F. B.

In China Christianity was already widespread in the 8th century. Testimony to this is a 1200 year old stone tablet, which not only contains an account of the creation, the original state of man, the fall of man, the incarnation, the death and resurrection of Christ, but also the table of contents of the 27 books of the New Testament and a statement of the main doctrines of Christianity.